Bombay Sanskrit Series.

No. VII.

NÂGOJÎBHAṬṬA'S PARIBHÂSHENDUŚEKHARA.

Bombay Sanskrit Series.

No. VII.

NÂGOJÎBHAṬṬA'S PARIBHÂSHENDUŚEKHARA.

# THE

# PARIBHÂSHENDUŚEKHARA

OF

# NÂGOJÎBHAṬṬA

EDITED AND EXPLAINED

BY

F. KIELHORN, Ph. D.,

SUPERINTENDENT OF SANSKRIT STUDIES IN DECCAN COLLEGE,

&c. &c. &c.

## Part II.

### TRANSLATION AND NOTES.

(PARIBHÂSHÂS I.-XXXVII.)



Bombay:

PRINTED AT THE "INDU-PRAKÂSH" PRESS.

1871.

## HOMAGE TO GAṆES'A!

Having paid homage to S'iva who, though united with Ambâ, is the supreme object of meditation, the learned Nâges'a composes the Paribhâshendus'ekhara, that students may learn (the Paribhâshâs) with ease.

(In this work) are explained the Paribhâshâs which in the works of older grammarians[1] were given as Sûtras but are in this grammar of Pâṇini's (mostly) established by Jnâpakas and Nyâyas, provided[2] they are contained in the Bhâshya and the Vârttikas.

### Paribhâshâ I.

The same letter ण् is made use of (as Anubandha) both in (the sixth S'ivasûtra) लण् and in (the first) अ इ उण्; there arises consequently the doubt whether (the Pratyâhâras) अण् and इण्, when they are employed (in Pâṇini's grammar, are formed with the ण् of the former or with the ण् of the latter Sûtra), and one might (on that account) consider it impossible to ascertain (what

1 *I. e.*, Indra and others.

2 Hereby Nâgojîbhaṭṭa intimates that those Paribhâshâs which are actually given in Pâṇini's grammar, will not be explained, and that some Paribhâshâs of the older grammarians are not authoritative.

Pâṇini intends to denote by अण् and इण् when he employs these terms. The author of the Paribhâshâs) says therefore :

**P. I : The precise (meaning of an ambiguous term) is ascertained from interpretation, for (a rule), even though it contain an ambiguous term, must nevertheless teach (something definite).**

*I.e.,* the precise (meaning of an ambiguous term), *i.e.,* what particular meaning out of the two or more (meanings which an ambiguous term may convey) it actually does convey (in a particular rule), is ascertained from the interpretation[1] given by the learned,[2] for a rule must necessarily teach something (definite) even though (one of its terms) be ambiguous ; the reason being that a rule ought to teach something which does not admit of any doubt. In other words : the object of this grammar (of Pâṇini's) is to teach something that does not admit of any doubt ; if Pâṇini then employs in it terms which are ambiguous (and on that account give rise to doubt) he informs[3] us thereby that inter-

---

1. *I. e.*, by traditional instruction of such kind as is described in the verse

पदच्छेदः पदार्थोक्तिर्विग्रहो वाक्ययोजना ।
आक्षेपोऽथ समाधानं व्याख्यानं षड्विधं मतम् ॥

'interpretation is considered to be concerned with the following six points, viz., the separation of the words, the rendering the meanings of the words, the analysis of the words formed by means of affixes or by composition, the construction of the sentences, the raising of objections, and afterwards the removal of them.'

2. *I. e.*, the author of the Bhâshya and others.

3. Nâgojîbhaṭṭa purposely uses the word बोध्यते (and not ज्ञाप्यते) in order to show that the employment of the same Anubandha ण् in two S'ivasûtras, although it suggests the existence of the Paribhâshâ under discussion, can nevertheless not be called its *Jnâpaka.* A Jnâpaka, meaningless and superfluous before the Paribhâshâ the existence of

pretation is the only means required for the removal of their ambiguity. Accordingly[1] (we learn from interpretation that) the term अण्, except in P. I., 1, 69, is formed by means of the (ण् of the) first (S'ivasûtra अ इ उण्), and that the term इण् is formed by means of the (ण् of the) subsequent (S'ivasûtra लण्). All this is found in the Bhâshya on the Sûtra लण्.

which it indicates has been established by it, becomes necessary and significant, as soon as that Paribhâshâ has been accepted. Such is however not the case with the employment of ण् in the two S'ivasûtras.

1 तेन, *i. e.*, व्याख्यानेनैव. P.—The ambiguity being removed by the interpretation of the learned, it is useless to take the trouble to seek for Jnâpakas that might remove it.

---

Bhâshya on S'ivasûtra 6, लण् ॥ अयं णकारो द्विरनुबध्यते पूर्वश्चैव परश्च । तत्राण्ग्रहणेष्विण्ग्रहणेषु च संदेहो भवति पूर्वेण वा स्युः परेण वेति । कतरस्मिंस्तावदण्ग्रहणे[1] संदेहः । ढ्रलोपे पूर्वस्य दीर्घोऽणः [६.३.१११] इति । असंदिग्धम् । पूर्वेण न परेण । कुत एतत् । पराभावात् । न हि ढ्रलोपे परेऽणः सन्ति । ननु चायमस्ति । आतृढ इति । आवृढ इति[2] । एवं तर्ह्यण्ग्रहणसामर्थ्यात्[3]पूर्वेण न परेण । यदि हि परेण स्यादण्ग्रहणमनर्थकं स्यात् । ढ्रलोपे पूर्वस्य दीर्घोऽच इत्येव ब्रूयात् । अथवैतदपि न ब्रूयात् । अचो ह्येतद्भवति ह्रस्वो दीर्घः प्लुत इति ॥ अस्मिंस्तर्ह्यण्ग्रहणे संदेहः । केऽणः [७. ४. १३.] इति । ......refuted as before. ॥ अस्मिंस्तर्ह्यण्ग्रहणे संदेहः । अणोऽप्रगृह्यस्यानुनासिकः [८. ४. ५७.] इति । ......similarly refuted. ॥ अस्मिंस्तर्ह्यण्ग्रहणे संदेहः । उरण् रपरः [१. १. ५१.] इति । असंदिग्धम् । पूर्वेण न परेण । कुत

1. Ed. कतमस्मिन्. 2. Ed. आतृढम् आवृढमिति ।. 3. Ed. om. अण्ग्रहण.

एतत्। पराभावात्। न ह्युः स्थाने परेऽणः संभवन्ति[1]। ननु चायमस्ति। कर्त्रर्थम् हर्त्रर्थमिति। किं च स्यात्। यद्यत्र रपरः[2] स्याद्द्वयो रेफयोः श्रवणं प्रसज्येत। हलो यमां यमि [८. ४. ६४.] इत्येवमेकस्यात्र लोपो भविष्यति[3]। विभाषा स लोपः। विभाषा श्रवणं प्रसज्येत। अयं तर्हि नित्यो लोपो रो रि [८. ३. १४.] इति। पदान्तस्येत्येवं सः। न शक्यः पदान्तस्येति[4] विज्ञातुम्। इह हि लोपो न स्यात्। जर्गृधेर्लङ्। अजर्घाः। पास्पर्धेः। अपास्पा इति। इह तर्हि मातॄणां पितॄणामिति रपरत्वं प्रसज्येत। आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति नात्र रपरत्वं भवति यदयमृत इद्धातोः [७. १. १००.] इति धातुग्रहणं करोति। कथं कृत्वा ज्ञापकम्। धातुग्रहणस्यैतत्प्रयोजनम्। इह मा भूत्। मातॄणां पितॄणामिति। यदि चात्र रपरत्वं स्याद्धातुग्रहणमनर्थकं स्यात्। रपरत्वे कृतेऽनन्त्यत्वा[5]दित्त्वं न भविष्यति। पश्यति त्वाचार्यो नात्र रपरत्वं भवतीति ततो धातुग्रहणं करोति। इहापि तर्हीत्त्वं[6] न प्राप्नोति। चिकीर्षति जिहीर्षतीति। मा भूदेवम्। उपधायाश्च [७. १. १०१.] इत्येवं भविष्यति। इहापि तर्हि प्राप्नोति। मातॄणां पितॄणामिति। तस्मात्तत्र धातुग्रहणं कर्तव्यम्। एवं तर्हि सामर्थ्यात्। अण्ग्रहणसामर्थ्यात्[7]पूर्वेण न परेण। यदि हि[8] परेण स्यादण्ग्रहणमनर्थकं स्यात्। उरत्रपर इत्येव ब्रूयात्॥ अस्मिंस्तर्ह्यण्ग्रहणे संदेहः। अणुदित्सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः [१. १. ६९.] इति। असंदिग्धम्। परेण न पूर्वेण। कुत एतत्। सवर्णेऽण्ग्रहणं[9] तपरं ह्युरृत् [७. ४. ७.]। यदयमुरृदिति तपरं[10] करोति तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यः

---

1. Ed. सन्ति. 2. Ed. रपरत्वं. 3. Ed. भविष्यतीति. 4. Ed. शक्यः स पदान्तस्येत्येवं. 5. Ed. अनन्त्यत्वात्. 6. Ed. om. इत्त्वं. 7. Ed. om. अण्ग्रहणसामर्थ्यात्. 8. Ed. om. हि. 9. Ed. सवर्णेऽण्. 10. Ed. ऋकारस्य तपरकरणं.

परेण न पूर्वेणेति[1] ॥ इण्ग्रहणेषु तर्हि संदेहः । असंदिग्धम् । परेण न पूर्वेण । कुत एतत् । य्वोरन्यत्र (cf. VI, 4, 77) परेणेण् स्यात् । यत्रेच्छति पूर्वेण संमृद्य ग्रहणं तत्र करोति य्वोरिति । तद्गुरु[2] भवति । कथं कृत्वा ज्ञापकम् । तत्र विभक्तिनिर्देशे संमृद्य ग्रहणे चार्धचतस्रो मात्राः प्रत्याहारग्रहणे पुनस्तिस्रो मात्राः । सोऽयमेवं लघीयसा न्यासेन सिद्धे सति यद्गरीयांसं यत्नमारभते तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यः परेण न पूर्वेणेति[3] ॥ किं पुनर्वर्णोत्सत्ताविवार्यं णकारो द्विरनुबध्यते । एतज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यो भवत्येषा परिभाषा व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि संदेहादलक्षणमित्यणुदित्सवर्णं परिहाय पूर्वेणाण्ग्रहणं परेणेण्ग्रहणमिति व्याख्यास्यामः ॥

Nâgojîbhaṭṭa on सवर्णेऽण्ग्रहणं तपरं ‥ ॥ यदुक्तं सूत्रे तपरं करोति तज्ज्ञापकं सवर्णेऽण्ग्रहणं परणकारकमिति वार्त्तिकाक्षरार्थः ॥

The same on संमृद्य ॥ आदेशेन तौ निवर्त्येत्यर्थः ॥

Kaiyaṭa on अर्धचतस्र इति ॥ अर्धेन चतस्रः । चतुर्थी हि मात्रा तत्रार्धमिति ॥ किं पुनरिति । वर्णोत्सत्तिर्वर्णोच्छेदः । वर्णान्तरमनुबन्धः किं न क्रियत इत्यर्थः ॥ व्याख्यानत इति । न्यायादागमाद्वा शब्दशक्तिरनुसरणीयेत्यर्थः ॥

Nâgojîbhaṭṭa on the last words of Kaiyaṭa: ननु ज्ञापितेऽपि प्रवर्तकतया निवर्तकतया वा नास्य चारितार्थ्यमत आह । न्यायादिति । उक्तो न्यायः । आगम उपदेशपरंपरा तत्सिद्ध एवायमर्थो णकारानुबन्धनरूपस्वव्यवहारेण बोध्यत इत्यर्थः । एवं च व्याख्यानेनैव पूर्वणकारेण केचित्परणकारेणेति निर्णये ज्ञापकानुसरणक्लेशो वृथेति सूचितम् ॥

---

1. Ed. पूर्वेणेति. 2. Ed. तच्च गुरु. 3. Ed. पूर्वेण.

## PARIBHÂSHÂS II. AND III.

In order to show that there are two alternatives under which Saṃjnâs, (*i. e.*, technical terms or rules teaching them), and Paribhâshâs may be viewed in this[1] (grammar of Pâṇini's, the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

P. II: Saṃjnâs and Paribhâshâs remain where they are taught.

P. III: Saṃjnâs and Paribhâshâs are attracted by, (or unite with, the rules that enjoin certain) operations, (provided the Saṃjnâs occur or are valid in those rules, and provided the Paribhâshâs concern them).

यथोद्देशम् (is an Avyayîbhâva-compound, meaning) 'not going beyond the उद्देश'; and this (word उद्देश)[2] denotes 'the place where (a Saṃjnâ or a Paribhâshâ) is taught.' Saṃjnâs and Paribhâshâs are everywhere in grammar employed with that force and in that sense which is assigned to them by the meaning of a sentence in that place in which they are taught. 'Place' however we call in grammar simply the time of utterance, (*i. e.*, the time when a Saṃjnâ-rule or a Paribhâshâ is given).

According to Kaiyaṭa on P. I., 1, 11 this (first) alternative refers to those scholars who accept what they are taught as they hear it, and who, when they have understood the meaning of a parti-

1. In order to establish a connection with the preceding, Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says तत्र 'in this,' *i. e.*, 'in this S'âstra,' the word लक्षणे being supplied from the last word अलक्षणम् of Paribhâshâ I.

2. अधिकरणसाधनश्चायम्, *scil.* उद्देशशब्दः.

cular sentence (in which a Saṃjnâ or a Paribhâshâ is taught) rest satisfied with the general knowledge[1] that what they have learned will be of some use on a future occasion.

Some[2] however (give the following explanation of the Yathoddes'apaksha). They maintain in regard to the Paribhâshâs that, as soon as one has learned the meaning *e. g.* of the sentence P. I., 1., 66. तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य (which is a Paribhâshâ), one has to ascertain in which (rules) a term is exhibited in the Locative case, has to place all these rules near the Paribhâshâ, has further, in order to construe each of them properly,[3] to repeat the (Paribhâshâ, which is) subservient (to them), as often as there are

---

1. ज्ञानमात्रेण ; P. मात्रपदेन विशेषज्ञानव्यावृत्तिः; they know generally that what they have learned will be useful, but they have not the special knowledge how it will be useful.—Cf. Kaiyaṭa on P. I., 1, 11: यथोद्देशपक्षाश्रयेण परिहारः। कथं पुनरयं पक्षो यावता कार्यार्थत्वात्संज्ञापरिभाषस्य कार्यकालतैव न्याय्या । नैष दोषः । यदानुद्दिश्य प्रयोजनविशेषं प्रयोजनमात्रमभिसंधाय भविष्यति किंचिदनेन प्रयोजनमिति संज्ञापरिभाषं प्रणीयते तदा संभवत्येवायं पक्षो यथाश्रुतग्राहिप्रतिपत्त्रपेक्षः। महावाक्यार्थपर्यालोचनप्रवृत्तप्रतिपत्त्रपेक्षस्तु कार्यकालपक्षः ॥

2. In order to show that Kaiyaṭa's view of the Yathoddes'apaksha is not merely open to objections, but is quite inadmissible, and to indicate his own dissent from Kaiyaṭa which he had already hinted at by saying कैयटः, Nâgojîbhaṭṭa now gives from केचित्तु—आहुः (on pag. 4, 1), the established view of the Bhâshya; he does not however entirely approve even of this view (see below).—केचित्; *i. e.*, भाष्यतत्त्वविदः 'those who know the real meaning of the Bhâshya.'

3. P. संस्कारो विशिष्टवाक्यार्थनिश्चयः; *e. g.*, after one has placed the rule VI., 1, 77 इको यणचि near the Paribhâshâ तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य, one construes the former rule by the help of this Paribhâshâ thus: अचि परतः पूर्वस्याव्यवहितस्येको यण् भवति.—गुणभेदम्, *i. e.*, परिभाषाभेदम्; the Paribhâshâs are given for the sake of other rules and are therefore subservient to them.

rules (containing a Locative), and to form (of each rule with the Paribhâshâ that has thus been assigned to it) *one* sentence. The difference (between the Yathoddes'a- and Kâryakâlapaksha according to this view is this, that on the Yathoddes'apaksha the rules given in P. VIII, 2-4 cannot be placed near the Paribhâshâs contained in or indicated by a Jnâpaka in P. I.-VIII., 1, because they so far as the latter are concerned do not exist, whereas) on the Kâryakâlapaksha (the Paribhâshâs) are also placed (near those rules which are given) in P. VIII., 2-4.[1]

With a view to this very circumstance, (that the Paribhâshâs become united with the rules which they concern, on the Yathoddes'apaksha as well as on the Kâryakâlapaksha,) it has been said in the Bhâshya[2] on P. I., 1, 49: '*Adhikâras*, as is well known, are of three kinds; some elucidate, though standing in *one* place, the whole grammar, just as a bright-shining lamp illuminates a whole house.' Kaiyaṭa remarks on this passage, that the word *Adhikâra* denotes also a Paribhâshâ because the latter (like an Adhikâra) is given for the sake of other (rules), and that the word 'some' means 'the Paribhâshâs.'—The drift of all this is, that a Paribhâshâ by conveying its meaning becomes of service to the whole grammar just as a lamp illuminates with its light

1. On the Kâryakâlapaksha, therefore, a Paribhâshâ forms one sentence with any rule in Pâṇini's grammar, which it concerns, but on the Yathoddes'apaksha only with the rules in P. I.-VIII., 1. In both cases the meaning of the Paribhâshâ is learned in the place where the Paribhâshâ is taught.

2. Cf. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 49: अधिकारो नाम त्रिप्रकारः | कश्चिदेकदेशस्थः सर्वशास्त्रमभिज्वलयति यथा दीपः सुप्रज्वलितः सर्वं वेश्माभिज्वलयति ||; Kaiyaṭa: अधिकारो नामेति | पारार्थ्यसाम्यात्परिभाषाप्यधिकार इत्युच्यते || कश्चिदिति | परिभाषारूप इत्यर्थः ||

1. Ed. सर्वं शास्त्र°. 2. Ed. प्रदीपः.

a whole house. And the above (passage from the) Bhâshya refers equally to both alternatives (the Yathoddes'a- and the Kâryakâlapaksha), because we learn from it that under both alternatives (a Paribhâshâ unites itself and) forms one sentence with each of the rules (which it concerns.) Regarding this (union, however,) there is this difference. On the Yathoddes'apaksha, all rules (that are concerned by particular Paribhâshâs) being present to the mind at the time when those Paribhâshâs are met with, each Paribhâshâ is understood so often as there are rules (concerned by it) and unites itself severally with all of them. This has been stated by Kaiyaṭa[1] on P. I., 1, 5: 'on the Yathoddes'apaksha the main rules are for their own proper construction placed near the rules subservient to them and cause the latter to be

---

1. Cf. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 5: अथवा कार्यकालं हि[1] संज्ञापरिभाषम् । यत्र कार्यं तत्र द्रष्टव्यम् । पुगन्तलघूपधस्य गुणो भवतीत्युपस्थितमिदं भवति क्ङिति नेति ॥ अथवा यदेतस्मिन्योगे क्ङिद्ग्रहणं तदनवकाशम् । तस्यानवकाशत्वाद्गुणवृद्धी न भविष्यतः ॥ Kaiyaṭa: यत्र गुणवृद्धी विधीयेते तत्र क्ङिति नेत्युपतिष्ठत इत्येवमियं परिभाषा भवति । तत्र पुगन्तलघूपधस्येत्यत्रास्या उपस्थाने सति येन नाव्यवधानमिति भिन्नमित्यादौ निषेधो भविष्यति ॥ अथवेति । मा भूत्परिभाषा । तथापि प्रतिषेधस्य प्रतिषेध्यापेक्षायां यावन्तो यादृशाः प्रतिषेद्धव्यास्तावन्ति प्रतिषेधसूत्राणीति पुगन्तलघूपधगुणे प्रतिषेध्ये ऽनवकाशः प्रतिषेधो व्यवहितेऽपि प्रवर्तते ॥ अथवा यथोद्देशपक्षाश्रयेण भाष्यम् । तथा हि प्रधानान्यात्मसंस्काराय संनिधीयमानानि गुणभेदं प्रयुञ्जत इति यदेतस्मिन्नित्युक्तम् ॥

This passage refers in the first instance to the relationship between Nishedhas or rules forbidding something and Vidhis or rules enjoining that which the Nishedhas forbid. In the present case all rules that enjoin the substitution of Guṇa (*e. g.*, P. VII., 3, 86 पुगन्तलघूपधस्य च) have on the Yathoddes'apaksha to be placed near the Nishedha P. I., 1, 5 क्ङिति च; and the latter has to be repeated as many times as there are rules enjoining Guṇa, so that each of the latter rules may be taken together with, as it were, one copy of the Nishedha. See below.

1. Ed. om. हि.

understood as many times as there are main rules.' On the Kâryakâlapaksha however the Paribhâshâ is understood whenever any of the rules (concerned by it) is met with, and unites itself (with each of these rules.) In the above (quotation from the Bhâshya Patanjali) employs the phrase 'standing in *one* place' in order to show that, although the various (Paribhâshâs on the Kâryakâlapaksha) are understood whenever any (rules which they concern) are met with, they nevertheless do not actually assume a new position near these rules. The case is the same with people engaged in business transactions; although they visit various countries in pursuit of their vocations, they are nevertheless not called residents of those countries but inhabitants of the places in which their ancestors have been settled.

Rules[1] which forbid anything, as they require something particular that should be forbidden by them, must be taken together with the rules which enjoin (what they themselves forbid); and as they in this respect resemble the Paribhâshâs (which likewise unite themselves with the rules to which they relate), they also are called *Paribhâshâs* in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 5. They either form actually one sentence (with the rules that enjoin what they forbid) by entering them as limitations; or when they are added separately as exceptions to the rules, their meaning and the meaning of the rules of which they are exceptions are joined together so as to form one meaning.[2]

---

1. In the passage from the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 5, quoted above, Nishedhas are comprised under the term *Paribhâshâ*; this requires an explanation which is given here.

2. The terms पर्युदास and प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध are explained in the S'loka

पर्युदासस्तु विज्ञेयो यत्रोत्तरपदेन नञ्।
प्रसज्यप्रतिषेधस्तु क्रियया सह यत्र नञ्॥

A Saṃjnâ-rule however does on the Kâryakâlapaksha not by itself convey any meaning but does so only in conjunction with the meaning of a rule (in which the Saṃjnâ occurs). As therefore (the Saṃjnâ-rule) P. I., 1, 12 (by which the vowels ई and ऊ of अमी and अमू are termed *pragṛihya*,) unites itself (on the Kâryakâlapaksha) with P. VIII., 4, 57 (in which the term *pragṛihya* occurs), the substitution of मु etc. (for the द of अदस which is taught in P. VIII., 2, 80, etc.), is not (by P. VIII., 2, 1) *asiddha*, (*i. e.*, considered as not having taken place) in regard to it. For as (an operation) is asiddha in regard to (another) operation, (the meaning of P. VIII., 2, 1 being पूर्वस्मिन्कर्तव्ये परमसिद्धम्), it can be asiddha only after the (other) operation has become known; (in the present case), however, the (other) operation (viz., the application of the term *pragṛihya* to the ई and ऊ of अमी and अमू )becomes known only when the rule (P. VIII., 4, 57 in which the term *pragṛihya* occurs) is being taught, and as this rule and everything connected with it is (itself) asiddha (in regard to the preceding rule VIII., 2, 80) it cannot be included in the term पूर्व (of P. VIII., 2, 1 पूर्वत्रासिद्धम्. In other words, the substitution of मु which is taught in P. VIII., 2, 80, cannot be

---

In the Nishedha P. I., 1, 5 क्ङिति च Guṇa and Vṛiddhi are forbidden, गुणवृद्धी being valid from one of the preceding rules. As soon as we, therefore, learn this Nishedha we have to place all rules that enjoin Guṇa or Vṛiddhi, (*e. g.*, P. VII., 3, 84 सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोः) near it, and have to combine the Nishedha severally with each of these rules. This union may be effected in two ways. We may either unite the *words* of the Nishedha with those of, *e. g.*, P. VII., 3, 84 and form one sentence of both rules, thus: अक्ङित्सार्वधातुकादौ *i. e.* क्ङिद्भिन्नसार्वधातुकादौ गुणः; or we may place one rule close by the other, *e. g.*, thus, सार्वधातुकार्धधातुकयोः (परयोर्गुणः), क्ङिति (परे गुणो) न (भवति), and unite the *meanings* of both.

asiddha in regard to the application of the term *pragṛihya* taught in P. I., 1, 12, because P. I., 1, 12 does not precede, but follows upon, P. VIII., 2, 80, its position being near the rule P. VIII., 4, 57).

In like manner the question whether a Saṃjnâ-rule or another rule that applies simultaneously with it, ought to take effect, can only be decided after the meaning of the Saṃjnâ-rule has become known (in the place where a rule that contains the Saṃjnâ is taught), and consequently (the Saṃjnâ-rule) must, so far as the working of the Vipratishedha-rule (P. I., 4, 2.) is concerned, be considered as subsequent (to all rules that precede the rule in which the Saṃjnâ occurs). This is the reason why it has been said in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 12, that on the Kâryakâlapaksha the term *pragṛihya* (or the rule which teaches the application of this term) is subsequent to (the substitutes) अय् etc. (taught in P. VI., 1, 78 etc.).[1]

In regard, however, to the terms *Bha, Pada,* etc., taught in P. I., 4—II., 2 (where of several Saṃjnâs that apply simultaneously the subsequent one supersedes the preceding one) there exists only the Yathoddes'apaksha, and whenever therefore the Vipratishedha-rule P. I., 4, 2 is brought

1. Because, although the Pragṛihya-Saṃjnâ-rule in Pâṇini's grammar precedes the rule which teaches the substitution of अय्, etc., the meaning of the Saṃjnâ-rule is not learned in the place where the Saṃjnâ-rule is taught. With regard to Saṃjnâ-rules, therefore, it is clear that they on the Kâryakâlapaksha are *para* in reference to all rules that precede a rule in which the Saṃjnâ occurs or is valid. The Paribhâshâs, on the other hand, are even on the Kâryakâlapaksha *para* only in regard to such rules as actually precede them (or their Jnâpakas) in Pâṇini's work.—See below.

to bear on them, they are subsequent to (and supersede consequently) only such rules as actually precede them (in Pâṇini's grammar).[1] The terms *pada* etc. are also in P. VIII., 2-4 employed with that force which the meaning of the rules in which they are taught assigns to them. (As these terms) therefore (are on the Yathoddes'apaksha beyond any doubt valid also in P. VIII., 2-4), it has in the Bhâshya on P. VIII, 2, 1[2] only in

---

1. If the Kâryakâlapaksha were admitted for the Saṃjnâ-rules which teach the meaning of *bha, pada,* etc., then the Pada-Saṃjnâ-rule I, 4, 17, for instance, would in the manner described before take its position near the rule P. VIII., 2, 7, in which the word पद is valid. Rule I, 4, 17 would then stand in P. VIII., 2-4 and being therefore asiddha in regard to the Bha-Saṃjnâ-rule I., 4, 18, would not be superseded by the latter rule. In the formation of *e. g.* the Accusative Plur. of राजन् (from राजन् + अस्), राजन् would consequently by P. I., 4, 17 be termed *Pada*, and would be subject to the substitution of Lopa for its final न् by VIII,, 2, 7. On the Yathoddes'apaksha, on the other hand, the Bha-Saṃjnâ-rule follows upon and supersedes therefore the Pada-Saṃjnâ-rule.—P: When in the Bhâshya on P. VI., 1, 13 the Kâryakâlapaksha of the Saṃjnâ *bha* is spoken of, then that must be considered as the statement of one who is only partly acquainted with the opinions of the author of the Bhâshya. Cf. note on Paribhâshâ XXXVII.

2. Bhâshya on P. VIII., 2, 1:

पूर्वत्रासिद्धम् ॥ येयं सपादसप्ताध्याय्यनुक्रान्तेतस्यामयं पादोनोऽध्यायोऽसिद्धो वेदितव्यः । यदि सपादायां सप्ताध्याय्यामयं पादोनोऽध्यायोऽसिद्ध इत्युच्यते य इह सप्तमीनिर्देशाः पञ्चमीनिर्देशाः षष्ठीनिर्देशाश्चोच्यन्ते तेऽप्यसिद्धाः स्युः । तत्र को दोषः। झलो झलि [८. २. २६] ह्रस्वादङ्गात् [८. २. २७] संयोगान्तस्य लोपः [८. २.२३] इत्येतेषां निर्देशानामसिद्धत्वात्तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य षष्ठी स्थानेयोगेत्येताः परिभाषा न प्रकल्पेरन् । नैष दोषः । यद्यपीदं तत्रासिद्धं तत्त्विह सिद्धम् । कथम् । कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषं यत्र कार्यं तत्रैवोपस्थितं द्रष्टव्यम् । झलो झलि ह्रस्वा-

regard to the Paribhâshâs been questioned whether they apply (also to rules) in P. VIII., 2-4; subsequently (the doubt thus raised) is removed by the adoption of the Kâryakâlapaksha.

The Yathoddes'apaksha[1] has been treated of in the Bhâshya in the chapter on the term *pragrihya.*

The word कार्यकालम्, on the other hand, means 'attracted by an operation' (or rather, by a rule that teaches an operation. The meaning of Paribhâshâ III. is consequently) in other words this, that (a rule which teaches) an operation requires for its own construction the Paribhâshâs that are indicated by certain peculiarities in the rule.[2] Therefore it has been said in the Bhâshya on P. VIII., 2, 1, after it had

---

दङ्गात् संयोगान्तस्य लोपः । उपस्थितमिदं भवति तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य षष्ठी स्थानेयोगेति ॥ यदि कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषमित्युच्यत इयमपि परिभाषास्ति विप्रतिषेधे परमिति सापीहोपतिष्ठेत । तत्र को दोषः । विस्फोर्यमवगोर्यमिति गुणाद्दीर्घत्वं[1] स्याद्विप्रतिषेधेन । अत उत्तरं पठति । पूर्वत्रासिद्धे नास्ति विप्रतिषेधो ऽभावादुत्तरस्य । पूर्वत्रासिद्धे नास्ति विप्रतिषेधः । किं कारणम् । अभावादुत्तरस्य । द्वयोर्हि सावकाशयोः समवस्थितयोर्विप्रतिषेधो भवति न च पूर्वत्रासिद्धे परं पूर्वं प्रति भवति ॥ यद्येवं दोग्धा दोग्धुं घत्वस्यासिद्धत्वाड्ढत्वं[2] प्राप्नोति । काष्ठतट् संयोगादिलोपस्यासिद्धत्वात्संयोगान्तलोपः[3] प्राप्नोति । अपवादौ वचनप्रामाण्यात् । अनवकाशावेतौ विधी तौ वचनप्रामाण्याद्भविष्यतः । तस्मात्कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषमिति न दोषः ॥

For Kaiyaṭa's comment on the words तत्त्विह सिद्धम् see pag. 16.

1. P: Nâgojîbhaṭṭa adduces this proof for the existence of the Yathoddes'apaksha, because this alternative is weak.

2. *E. g.* In order to construe the rule इको यणचि, we must know the Paribhâshâ तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य which is indicated to us by the Locative case अचि; and we must likewise know the Paribhâshâ षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा indicated by the Genitive इकः.

1. By P. VIII., 2, 77. 2. By P. VIII., 2, 31. 3. By P. VIII., 2, 23.

previously been questioned whether the Paribhâshâs[1] contained in P. I.-VIII., 1 apply to the rules in P. VIII., 2-4, considering that these latter rules are asiddha (in regard to what precedes them in Pâṇini's grammar) : 'although what is taught in P. VIII., 2-4 is asiddha in regard to that which is taught before, nevertheless that which is taught in P., I.-VIII, 1 is siddha in regard to the rules in P. VIII., 2-4 ;' and when (the opponent) asks 'how is this ?' intimating thereby that it is nevertheless (impossible for the Paribhâshâs in P. I-VIII., 1 to get near the rules in P. VIII., 2-4, so long as the latter are) asiddha, he is answered thus 'कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम्' *i. e.* 'Saṃjnâ-rules and Paribhâshâs must be considered to take their position near (the rules that enjoin) an operation (when they occur or are valid in, or concern, those rules).'[2]

---

1. The Saṃjnâ-rules have been spoken of before.

2. The meaning of कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम् is not 'Saṃjnâ-rules and Paribhâshâs are effective in the formation of a word at the same time (*kâla*) with (a *kârya*, *i. e.*,) a rule that teaches a certain operation.'—Saṃjnâ-rules and Paribhâshâs take their position by the rules that teach an operation (provided the Saṃjnâs occur or are valid in those rules, and provided the Paribhâshâs concern them), because they are postulated by the latter rules. A rule which teaches an operation postulates for its own completion or construction a certain Paribhâshâ; the Paribhâshâ, likewise, postulates as something to be completed or construed by it, the rules which it concerns. In P. I.-VIII., 1 the rules and Paribhâshâs postulate each other mutually, while rules in P. VIII., 2-4 only postulate their Paribhâshâs, but are not postulated by them. Kaiyaṭa is wrong when he adopts the interpretation of the Paribhâshâ mentioned at the beginning of this note, and assumes a *mutual* postulation also for the rules in P. VIII., 2-4 and their Paribhâshâs. The passage of

Now one might say, and one might support one's view by referring to Kaiyaṭa's remark on P., I, 1, 3,[1] that, when two Paribhâshâs concern the same rule, one ought according to the above on the Kâryakâlapaksha not to speak of one Paribhâshâ being *para* *i. e.* subsequent to the other, because they both stand in one and the same place, both being attracted by the same rule; and that consequently the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 66 which does assume *paratva* in such a case, does not agree with the preceding. The Bhâshya[2] *l. c.* says namely with reference to P. VIII., 3, 32 and similar rules[3] by which (as they contain a term that stands in the Ablative and another term in the Locative case) on the Kâryakâlapaksha the two Paribhâshâs P. I., 1, 67 तस्मादित्युत्तरस्य and P. I., 1, 66 तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्य are attracted, that 'when in one and the same rule one term stands in the Locative and another in the Ablative case, the term which stands in the Ablative possesses great-

Kaiyaṭa here referred to occurs in his comment on the Bhâshya on P. VIII., 2, 1: तत्त्विह सिद्धमिति ॥ कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषमित्यस्मिन्दर्शने । संज्ञापरिभाषाणां ह्यत्यन्तपारार्थ्यान्न स्वातन्त्र्येण कार्यविगमे हेतुत्वं केवलमाचार्येण लाघवायानेकप्रधानाङ्गभावप्रतिपत्तये पृथगुपदेशः कृतः । ततश्च तस्मिन्निति निर्दिष्टे पूर्वस्येत्यनेन केवलेन न किंचित्क्रियते नापि झलो झलि [ ८. २. २६. ] इत्यनेन । किं तर्हि । संहत्य कार्यं क्रियते । ततो झल्यनन्तरे पूर्वसकारस्य झलः परस्य लोप इति वाक्यार्थ इत्येकवाक्यतायां पौर्वापर्याभावादसिद्धत्वाभावः ॥.—On the Yathoddes'apaksha Paribhâshâs which stand in P. I.-VIII., 1, cannot attract rules in P. VIII., 2-4, because the latter are asiddha in regard to the former.

1. Kaiyaṭa on P. I., 1, 3: यथोद्देशपक्षे परिभाषयोः पौर्वापर्यं न तु कार्यकालतायाम् ॥

2. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 66: उभयनिर्देशे विप्रतिषेधात्पञ्चमीनिर्देशो भविष्यति॥; Kaiyaṭa: विप्रतिषेधादिति ॥ सूत्रपाठापेक्षया परस्य व्यवस्थापकत्वमित्यर्थः ॥

3. Like P. VIII., 3, 29 डः सि धुट्.

er force than the other which stands in the Locative, (in other words, that Paribhâshâ 67 तस्मादि० supersedes Paribhâshâ 66 तस्मिन्नि०), because the former (in the order of Pâṇini's grammar) *follows* upon the latter Paribhâshâ.'—But (this statement of the Bhâshya) is quite correct (and the view according to which the one Paribhâshâ ought not to be considered as subsequent to the other, is) untenable, for the sequence spoken of in the Vipratishedha-rule (P. I., 4, 2) is (so far as the Paribhâshâs are concerned) established by the order in which (the Paribhâshâs) are actually given in Pâṇini's grammar; nor does this (sequence) cease to exist because (Paribhâshâs) are viewed under the Kâryakâlapaksha. Both alternatives namely (the Yathoddes'a- and the Kâryakâlapaksha) do not differ in this point that in both (the Paribhâshâs do not themselves leave the places in which they are taught, but merely) convey their meaning concerning the rules to which they relate, (either in their own place or near those rules); for a lifeless (Paribhâshâ-)rule cannot even on the Kâryakâlapaksha leave its own place and go to that place (where a rule stands which it concerns), nor does it abandon its own place by the fact that we or others refer its meaning (to the rule which it concerns).[1] For this reason, (*i. e.*, because a Paribhâshâ does not really abandon its place,) was it stated in the Bhâshya (quoted above), that (a Paribhâshâ) 'although standing in *one* place, elucidates the whole grammar,' and for the same reason says Kaiyaṭa on P. I., 1, 66 that 'the sequence in which we read (the Paribhâshâs) in Pâṇini's grammar decides

1. All this refers to the Paribhâshâs only; the Saṃjnâ-rules abandon, as we have observed before, on the Kâryakâlapaksha their own place and take their position near the rules in which the Saṃjnâ occurs or is valid. See below.

the question, which is to supersede which.' Kaiyaṭa's (remark) on P. I., 1, 3, however, (which was alluded to before,) is untenable.[1] Else, (were we to admit the view expressed by Kaiyaṭa

---

1. In reality sequence of rules is, so far as the Vipratishedha-rule is concerned, *everywhere* established by the order in which the rules are actually given in Pâṇini's grammar, and the Samjṇâ-rules form even on the Kâryakâlapaksha no exception. Nâgojîbhaṭṭa does not admit the statement on p. 3, 11 'एवं तद्बोधोत्तरमेव विरोधप्रतिसंधानं चेति तत्रत्यपरत्वमेव विप्रतिषेधसूत्रप्रवृत्तौ बीजम्' and he therefore (on p. 2, 4) has introduced the long passage of which that statement forms part, with the words केचित्तु. Had he altogether approved of the views propounded in the words केचित्तु—आहुः, then he would have introduced them with the words परे तु, as he does elsewhere. His own view he states when commenting on the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 12. The Vârttikakâra adopts on P. I., 1, 12 the view that a Samjṇâ-rule takes its position near the rules, in which the Samjṇâ occurs or is valid, and that it is *para* in reference to all rules that precede the rules near which it has taken its position. He says namely first that, ई, ऊ, and म् in अमी and अमू being asiddha (and the latter words therefore really = अदे and अदौ, in instances like अमी आसते, अमू आसाते, and अमी अत्र) the Sandhi-rule P. VI., 1, 78 which teaches the substitution of अय् for ए, and of आव् for औ, and P. VI., 1, 109 which teaches the substitution of ए for ए+अ would apply, if their application were not forbidden. Thereupon he goes on to say विप्रतिषेधाद्वा *i. e.* 'or when the question arises whether (in अमी आसते etc.) the term *pragrihya* is to be applied by P. I., 1, 12, or अय् etc. to be substituted by P. VI., 1, 78 etc. the term *pragrihya* will be applied by the Vipratishedha-rule'. To this the objection is raised that by the Vipratishedha-rule a subsequent rule supersedes a preceding one, whereas in the present instance the rules which teach the substitution of अय् etc. are preceded and not followed by the Pragṛihya-Samjṇâ-rule. This objection is answered with एवं तर्हि परैव प्रगृह्यसंज्ञा। कथम्। कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम्। यत्र कार्यं तत्रोपस्थितं द्रष्टव्यम्। प्रगृह्यः प्रकृत्येत्युपस्थितमिदं भवति। अदसो मादिति।. By the Paribhâshâ कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम् the Samjṇâ-rule stands near P. VI., 1,

on P. I., 1, 3 to be correct, then one might also maintain that), the object of all rules being the formation of words, they all stand, because they meet in the formation of words, in one and the same place, and thus there would nowhere be any sequence (of rules). Moreover, as in the manner described by Kaiyaṭa on P. I., 1, 5, the rules (that are concerned by certain Paribhâshâs) are on the Yathoddes'apaksha placed near their Paribhâshâs, their sequence (also) would be destroyed. And (all sequence of rules having) thus (ceased), such (statements) as this that 'in (the formation of) वृक्षेभ्यः ए is by P. VII., 3, 103 substituted (for the final अ of वृक्ष) in supersession of (the lengthening of the final अ taught in) P. VII., 3, 102, because the rule (which teaches the substitution of ए) *follows* (upon the other rule),' would be subverted. Sapienti sat.

---

125 and is therefore *para* in regard to P. VI., 1, 78 and 109 which rules teach the substitution of अय् etc. Here Nâgojîbhaṭṭa states his own view thus: परे तु परैवेत्यस्य संज्ञापदेन तत्कार्यं प्रकृतिभाव उच्यत इति भावः । आशयानभिज्ञस्य प्रश्नः । कथमिति । एकदेशिन उत्तरं कार्यकालमित्यादीत्याहुः ॥ एतेन कार्यकालपक्षे ऽपि पाठकृतपरत्वमयादीनामेव ॥ 'Others however (and I concur with them) say, that the word *pragṛihya-saṃjnâ* of the Bhâshya denotes that which is to be caused by it, viz. the unchangeableness of the vowels called *pragṛihya*; that the question 'how is this?' is raised by somebody who does not understand the purport of the preceding; and that the answer to it contained in the words कार्यकालम् etc. does not convey the established opinion of Patanjali, but merely the view of somebody who is only partly acquainted with what Patanjali considers correct. Accordingly the rules which teach the substitution of अय् etc. stand even on the Kâryakâlapaksha *after* the Pragṛihya-saṃjnâ-rule, just as they in Pâṇini's grammar are read after it.'

Nâgojîbhaṭṭa has stated that the Yathoddes'apaksha has been treated of by Patanjali in the chapter on the Pragṛihya-saṃjnâ. We proceed therefore to give a short analysis of part of the Bhâshya on P. I, 1, 11 (Ballantyne Ed. p. 345) which may serve to illustrate the bearing of both Paribhâshâs II. and III. on Saṃjnâ-rules. The Bhâshya commences with the statement that if we read in P. I., 1, 11 ईत्, ऊत् and एत्, the pluta vowels ई३, ऊ३, and ए३ will not be termed *pragṛihya*, because ईत्, ऊत् and एत् denote on account of their final त् the vowels ई, ऊ and ए containing two Mâtrâs, whereas the pluta vowels ई३, ऊ३, ए३ contain three Mâtrâs. Hereupon begins the following discussion: 'The pluta vowels (being taught in P. VIII, 2-4) are (in regard to the Pragṛihya-saṃjnâ-rule) asiddha, contain therefore (in regard to it) only two Mâtrâs, (and will be termed pragṛihya by P. I., 1, 11).' "The pluta vowels are siddha in regard to the Sandhi of vowels." 'How do you know this?' "It results from the fact that Pâṇini in VI., 1, 125 teaches that a pluta vowel remains unchanged when it is followed by a vowel." 'How does this proceeding of Pâṇini indicate that pluta vowels are siddha in regard to the Sandhi of vowels?' "It does indicate it because only something actually existing can undergo an operation; (if a pluta vowel because of its being taught in P. VIII, 2-4, were asiddha in regard to a Sandhi-rule in P. VI., Pâṇini would not teach in VI., 1, 125, that a pluta vowel remains unchanged when it is followed by a vowel)." 'What is the object for which Pâṇini indicates in VI., 1, 125, that pluta vowels are siddha in regard to the Sandhi of vowels?' "The object is this, that we need not read the words अप्लुतादप्लुते in P. VI., 1, 113. (If pluta vowels are siddha in regard to a Sandhi-rule, it suffices to say in P. VI., 1, 113 अतो रोः, for the त् both of अतः and of the supplied अति will prevent

us from applying the rule to pluta vowels.)" 'What does follow from the fact that pluta vowels are siddha in regard to the Sandhi of vowels? They are still asiddha in regard to a Saṃjnâ-rule, contain therefore (so far as P. I., 1, 11 is concerned) only two Mâtrâs (and will be termed pragṛihya by P. I., 1, 11).' "The pluta vowels are siddha likewise in regard to the Saṃjnâ-rule." 'How is this possible?' "कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम्। यत्र कार्यं तत्रोपस्थितं द्रष्टव्यम्। प्रगृह्यः प्रकृत्येत्युपस्थितमिदं भवति। ईदूदेद्द्विवचनं प्रगृह्यमिति। Saṃjnâ-rules and Paribhâshâs must be considered to take their position near the rules that teach an operation, provided the Saṃjnâs occur or are valid in them, and provided the Paribhâshâs concern them. (According to this Paribhâshâ) the Saṃjnâ-rule P. I., 1, 11 has taken its position near the (Sandhi-) rule P. VI., 1, 125 प्लुतप्रगृह्या अचि (and the pluta vowels being siddha in regard to the latter rule are therefore likewise siddha in regard to P. I., 1, 11)."

'What reason is there, however, why a pluta vowel should be termed pragṛihya?' "The reason is that it should possess the unchangeableness which would result from its being pragṛihya." 'For the sake of the unchangeableness the application of the term pragṛihya to a pluta vowel is unnecessary, for the unchangeableness will result from प्लुतः प्रकृत्या (of P. VI., 1, 125).' "This[1] cannot be admitted, for by admitting it we should disagree with the statement on P. VI., 1, 129 according to which the unchangeableness which (by the rule प्लुतः प्रकृत्या) attaches to a vowel on account of its being *pluta* is entirely distinct from the unchangeableness which (by the rule प्रगृह्यः प्रकृत्या) attaches to a vowel on account of its being *pragṛihya*; or, in other words, according to which a pluta vowel may lose the unchangeableness that

1. The above is not a literal translation of the words of the Bhâshya.

accrues to it from the rule प्लुत: प्रकृत्या, and still retain that unchangeableness which accrues to it from the rule प्रगृह्य: प्रकृत्या. Therefore we ought (in addition to P. I., 1, 11) to make the rule that pluta ई३, ऊ३ and ए३ must likewise be termed pragṛihya, in order that they may possess the unchangeableness that would result from their being termed pragṛihya."

'But suppose we were in P. I., 1, 11 to read ई, ऊ, and ए, instead of ईत्, ऊत्, and एत्, (would it also in that case be necessary to make the additional rule)?' "(Certainly, for) even then only the vowel ए would denote (also) the vowels homogeneous to it (and therefore also pluta ए३) but ई and ऊ would not do so." 'Why not?' "Because they are not contained in the Pratyâhâra अण् (and because therefore P. I., 1, 69 does not apply to them)."

'Suppose, then, we were in P. I.,1, 11 to read इ, उ, ए (instead of ईत्, ऊत्, एत्? (Here इ and उ would by P. I., 1, 69 denote the vowels homogeneous to them and therefore also ई३ and ऊ३, because इ and उ *are* contained in the Pratyâhâra अण्).' "This is impossible, for in this case the term pragṛihya would be applied also *e. g.* to the final इ of अकुर्वहि."

'We must therefore leave the rule P. I., 1, 11 as Pâṇini has given it, *i. e.* read in it the long vowels ईत्, ऊत्, and एत्. At the same time, if we do so, the pluta vowels ई३, ऊ३, and ए३ will not be termed pragṛihya by P. I., 1, 11. (How can we get rid of this difficulty?) Only by rejecting the opinion that pluta vowels are siddha in regard to the Sandhi of vowels, an opinion which was established by rather too many artifices (such as the assumption of a Jnâpaka and the actual change of one of Pâṇini's rules). Pluta vowels are asiddha, contain therefore only two Mâtrâs (and will be termed pragṛihya by P. I., 1, 11).' "How about

the Jnâpaka mentioned above, प्लुतप्रगृह्या अचि, (which was said to indicate that pluta vowels are siddha in regard to the Sandhi of vowels)?" 'प्लुतः प्रकृत्या (does not mean, that a pluta vowel is unchangeable, but) means, that a vowel for which a pluta vowel will be substituted, is unchangeable.' "But what about the object (for which Pâṇini was said to have indicated that pluta vowels are siddha in regard to the Sandhi of vowels), viz. that we need not read the words अप्लुतादप्लुते in P. VI., 1, 113?" '(To this we simply answer that Pâṇini) has actually given the words अप्लुतादप्लुते in VI., 1, 113.'

("So far so good. Still we maintain that we want a rule, in addition to P. I., 1, 11, to teach us that the pluta vowels ई, ऊ, and ए are likewise pragṛihya. In the preceding we have mentioned the Paribhâshâ कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम् and have said that by it the Saṃjnâ-rule takes its position near the rules that teach an operation, when the Saṃjnâ occurs or is valid in them. P. I., 1, 11 took, as we have seen, its position near P. VI., 1, 125 प्लुतप्रगृह्या अचि, and we admit now that the pluta vowels, being asiddha in regard to P. VI., 1, 125, are asiddha also in regard to P. I., 1, 11. However, by the same Paribhâshâ,) the Saṃjnâ-rule I., 1, 11 stands likewise near P. VIII., 4, 57 अणो ऽप्रगृह्यस्यानुनासिकः, and as the pluta vowels are siddha in regard to *this* rule (being taught before it) they are likewise siddha in regard to the Saṃjnâ-rule. (The result hereof is that, as far as the working of P. VIII., 4, 57 on *e. g.*, अग्नी३ is concerned, the final ई३ is not pragṛihya and we may therefore substitute for it the anunâsika ईँ३)." 'एवं तर्हि किं न एतेन यत्नेन कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषमिति। यथोद्देशमेव संज्ञापरिभाषम्। अत्र चासावसिद्धः। तस्यासिद्धत्वात्तत्काला एव भवन्ति॥ Very well; we give up the Paribhâshâ कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषम् and adopt the Paribhâshâ which teaches us that Saṃjnâ-rules and Paribhâshâs remain in the place where they are taught.

And under this view the pluta vowel is asiddha (in regard to the Pragṛihya-Saṃjnâ-rule I., 1, 11) contains therefore only two Mâtrâs (and will be termed pragṛihya by P. I., 1, 11).'

In order to illustrate the difference between the Yathoddes'a- and Kâryakâlapaksha in regard to Paribhâshâs, we quote the remarks of Bhaṭṭojîdîkshita on the formation of the Acc. Plur. राज्ञः (Si. Kau. I., p. 155) and on that of the Acc. Plur. प्रियाह्नः (Si. Kau. I., p. 163); in the former passage the Yathoddes'a-paksha has been adopted, in the latter the Kâryakâlapaksha.

(*a*). The *Yathoddes'apaksha:* Si. Kau. अल्लोपोऽनः। श्चुत्वम्। न चाल्लोपः स्थानिवत्पूर्वत्रासिद्धे तन्निषेधात्। नापि बहिरङ्गतयासिद्धो यथोद्देशपक्षे षाष्ठीं परिभाषां प्रति श्चुत्वस्यासिद्धतयान्तरङ्गाभावे परिभाषाया अप्रवृत्तेः। जञोर्ज्ञः। राज्ञः॥

शस् is the affix of the Acc. Plur.;

राजन्+शस् becomes by P. I., 3, 8 and 9

राजन्+अस्; here राजन् is termed *Bha* by P. I., 4, 18; consequently there applies P. VI., 4, 134 (अल्लोपोऽनः), which teaches the substitution of Lopa for the अ of राजन्. This substitution is indirectly caused by the affix अस्, because it is this affix which is the cause of राजन् being termed *Bha.* By the substitution of Lopa for अ, we obtain राज्न् + अस्. Here applies P. VIII., 4, 40 (स्तोः श्चुना श्चुः) by which ञ् should be substituted for न्.

Now arises the question whether P. I., 1, 57 (अचः परस्मिन्पूर्वविधौ one meaning of which rule is this, 'that a substitute for a vowel (such as Lopa for अ) when it is caused by something following (as *e. g.* by the affix अस्) is to be considered as not having taken place in regard to a rule which concerns that (न्) which follows upon that (ज्) which originally preceded the vowel (अ) for which the substitute (Lopa) has been substituted') applies here. If it did apply, ज् न् would be regarded as still separated by अ, and ञ् would not be substituted for न्. However, P. I., 1, 57 does not

apply, because the rule which teaches the substitution of ञ् for न् stands in P. VIII., 2-4 and because consequently the application of P. I., 1, 57 is in this case forbidden by the Vârttika on P. I., 1, 58 पूर्वत्रासिद्धे न स्थानिवत्.

But one might raise another objection to the substitution of ञ् for न्. The substitution of ञ् for न् is caused by the meeting of the two letters ज् and न्; the substitution of Lopa for the अ of राजन्, on the other hand, is caused, as we have seen, by the following affix अस्; the substitution of ञ् is therefore antaranga, and the substitution of Lopa for अ bahiranga. If we then apply here the Antaranga-paribhâshâ (Paribh. L.), the bahiranga substitute Lopa for अ will be asiddha *i. e.* regarded as not having been substituted, so far as the antaranga substitution of ञ् for न् is concerned; in other words, ज् and न् will be regarded as still separated by अ and the substitution of ञ् for न् can therefore not take place.

This objection is met by the statement that Paribhâshâs remain in the place where they are taught. The Antaranga-paribhâshâ, indicated as it is by ऊठ् in P. VI., 4, 132, stands on the Yathoddes'apaksha near the rule P. VI., 4, 132; consequently the substitution of ञ् for न्, being taught in P. VIII., 4, 40, is in regard to it asiddha, *i. e.* the substitute ञ्, which was said to be antaranga, does so far as the Antaranga-paribhâshâ is concerned not exist; it follows therefore that, as there is no antaranga, the Antaranga-paribhâshâ cannot apply, and that the substitution of Lopa for अ is not asiddha.—We substitute consequently ञ् for न् and obtain thus the form राज् ञ्+अस्=राज्ञः. (Cf. also Si. Kau. I., p. 157. प्रतिदीव्नः.)

(*b*). The *Kâryakâlapaksha*: Si. Kau: शसि प्रियाह्नः । इह पूर्वस्मादपि विभावल्लोपस्य स्थानिवद्भावान्न ष्टुत्वं कार्यकालपक्षे बहिरङ्गस्याल्लोपस्यासिद्धत्वाद्वा ॥

प्रियाष्टन्+शस्;=प्रियाष्टन्+अस्;=प्रियाष्ट् न्+अस्; here P. VIII., 4, 41 (ष्टुना ष्टुः) is applicable and by it ण् should be substituted for न्. But the taking effect of P. VIII., 4, 41 is prevented by the circumstance that the substitution of Lopa for अ must be considered as not having taken place; for in this case P. I., 1, 57 is not invalidated by the Vârttika पूर्वत्रासिद्धे न स्थानिवत्, because this Vârttika is limited by the other Vârttika (on P. I., 1, 58) तस्य दोषः संयोगादिलोपलत्वणत्वेषु. ट् and न् being regarded as separated by अ, न् cannot be changed to ण् by P. VIII., 4, 41.

Besides the substitution of ण् for न् is also prevented by the Antaranga-paribhâshâ. By that Paribhâshâ the bahiranga substitution of Lopa for अ is asiddha in regard to the antaranga substitution of ण् for न्, consequently ट् and न् are regarded as still separated by अ, and P. VIII., 4, 41 cannot take effect. One might object, that, as in the case of राज्ञः, so also here the Antaranga-paribhâshâ does not apply, because the substitution of ण् for न्, as being taught in P. VIII., 4, 41, is asiddha in regard to the Antaranga-paribhâshâ which stands near P. VI., 4, 132. But this objection is easily refuted. In the case of राज्ञः we had recourse to the Yathoddes'apaksha, but in the present instance we adopt the Kâryakâlapaksha. On the Kâryakâlapaksha the Antaranga-paribhâshâ stands near the antaranga rule P. VIII., 4, 41, and the substitution of ण् for न् which is taught by the latter rule, is therefore not asiddha in regard to the Antaranga-paribhâshâ. As therefore in this case an antaranga operation does exist, there is nothing to prevent the application of the Antaranga-paribhâshâ. (Cf., however, the Antaranga-paribhâshâ).

## Paribhâshâs IV. and V.

Anubandhas (*i. e.* indicatory letters etc. attached) are the (letters etc.) termed *it*; as it may appear doubtful whether they are or are not part (of that to which they are attached, the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

**P. IV: The Anubandhas are no part (of that to which they are attached);**

for that which forms part of anything is certainly some time or other observed in or on that (of which it is a part); but such is not the case with an Anubandha because we never see it in or on that which is intended to be denoted (by the term to which the Anubandha is attached).[1] In the case of such (Bahuvrîhi compounds) as शित् 'that whose Anubandha is श', कित् 'that whose Anubandha is क्', the composition must be regarded to have taken place (not because श् or क् *are* part of the terms to which they are attached, but) because they, though (in reality they merely) stand near (those terms), have by a kind of metaphor been considered part of them.

However (one might object that, if the Anubandhas did not form part of the terms to which they are attached but did merely stand near them, then in rules like P. IV., 2, 80 वुञ्छण्क° the letter ण् ought to be considered as Anubandha both of the preceding छ and of the following क, for it stands near both, and consequently the operation which results from an affix having the Anubandha

1. The branch of a tree, although, after it has been cut off, it does not appear on the tree, was observed on it before; therefore Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says 'is *some time or other* observed'. In the real language we see the affixes अ, इ, etc. which are intended to be denoted by अच्, इञ् etc., but we never see their Anubandhas च्, ञ etc.

ण् ought to take place both in the case of the affix छ and also in that of क. But this objection is easily refuted; for) such facts as this 'that in cases like P. IV., 2, 80 वुञ्छण्क° the operation which results from (an affix) having the Anubandha ण् (results from ण्) only in so far as it is connected with the preceding (छ and not in so far as it is connected with the following क)', must be ascertained from the interpretation (of P. IV., 2, 80 etc). In[1] the rule P. I., 3, 3, which teaches that a *final* consonant is termed *it* (and according to which the Anubandhas, if they really are no part of that to which they are attached, would therefore seem to be no Anubandhas at all) the word *final* denotes (metaphorically the consonant which stands) near the rest.

In reality however it is only correct to say that

## P. V: (The Anubandhas *are*) part (of that to which they are attached);

for in grammar we do find them in those (particular affixes etc. to which they are attached), whereas we find them nowhere else. That namely which forms no part (of a particular thing) is observed to form the same connection (which it forms with this particular thing also with other things), *e. g.* a crow (may be seen sitting) on a house and (it may also be seen) on a tree etc., (and it is therefore no part of the house); but an Anubandha is not (found to be) thus (connected with any affixes etc. whatsoever, and it can therefore not be correct to say that it is no part of that to which it is attached). Further (the Anubandhas are part of that to which they are attached) because only thus

1. Now one might say: 'You certainly put the axe to the root, for you destroy the *ittva* altogether, because P. I., 3, 3 cannot apply to your Anubandha.' Therefore he says 'In the rule' etc.

the formation of the Bahuvrîhi compounds (ञित्, कित् etc.), can be properly[1] explained, and (because this view does) not (necessitate the assumption that) the word अन्त्य 'final' (in P. I., 3, 3) has a metaphorical meaning. And besides, if (the Anubandhas) were no part (of that to which they are attached), then (the letters) ण् etc. in such affixes as ण, ञ, क would not (by P. I., 3, 7 and 8) be termed *it*, because they would not be the initial letters of those affixes; moreover[2] the letter च् of दघ्नच् (in P. V., 2, 37) would be superfluous (because the च् which stands between द्वयस and दघ्न would serve as Anubandha for both द्वयस and दघ्न). And[3] (all) this (that has been said in the preceding) is found in the Bhâshya on P. I., 3, 9; for there it has been said (after both

1. *I. e.* without assuming a metaphor.

2. The meaning of this is: 'If you maintain that the word आदि "initial" can easily be explained, *viz.* like the word अन्त्य "final" in the preceding, by परसमीप, I can give you another reason why the Anubandhas should be part.'

3. If you say that we learn from the traditional interpretation that the च् which stands before दघ्न, belongs only to the preceding द्वयस and not also to दघ्न, and that therefore the च् of दघ्नच् is not superfluous, I rejoin: 'And all this' etc. If the Anubandha *is* a part of something else, interpretation may determine of what it is a part, for it cannot be part of two things; but if it is not a part, interpretation is of no avail. Anything that stands near a certain thing may well at the same time stand near something else; no confusion can arise from this and interpretation is therefore out of place. Interpretation would have nothing to do with P. V., 2, 37 and the च् of दघ्नच् would be superfluous if the Anubandhas were no part of that to which they are attached. In the same manner interpretation would have nothing to do with the rule P. IV., 2, 80 mentioned above, and ण would be Anubandha both of ठ and of क.

alternatives have been considered): 'correct is only that (alternative) according to which the Anubandhas are part (of that to which they are attached)'; this[1] then is the point of view (from which we have to look at the whole question).

1. Both the greater simplicity of the second alternative which results from its not necessitating the assumption of metaphors, and the reason brought forward in support of it ('for in grammar we do find them etc.') prove the correctness of this alternative.

---

Extract from the Bhâshya[1] on P. I., 3, 9:

अथ यस्यानुबन्ध आसज्यते किं स तस्यैकान्तो भवत्याहोस्विदनेकान्तः । एकान्तस्तत्रोपलब्धेः । एकान्त इत्याह । कुतः । तत्रोपलब्धेः । तत्रस्थो ह्यसावुपलभ्यते । तद्यथा वृक्षस्था शाखा वृक्षैकान्तोपलभ्यते ॥ तत्रासरूपसर्वादेशदाप्प्रतिषेधेषु[2] पृथक्त्वनिर्देशोऽनाकारान्तत्वात् । तत्रासरूपविधौ दोषो भवति । कर्मण्यण् [ ३. २. १. ] आतोऽनुपसर्गे कः [ ३. २. ३. ] इति कविषयेऽण्णपि प्राप्नोति । सर्वादेशे च दोषो भवति । दिव औत्सर्वादेशः प्राप्नोति [ ७. १. ८४. ]। दाप्प्रतिषेधे पृथक्त्वनिर्देशः कर्तव्यः । अदाब्दैपाविति वक्तव्यम् । किं पुनः कारणं न सिध्यति । अनाकारान्तत्वात् । ननु चात्त्वे कृते भविष्यति । तद्यात्त्वं न प्राप्नोति । किं कारणम् । अनेजन्तत्वात् ॥ अस्तु तर्ह्यनेकान्तः । अ-

1. Extract from Kaiyaṭa on the above: एकान्तस्तत्रोपलब्धेरिति ॥ ननु यदेव संशयमितिनिमित्तं स एव कथं निश्चयहेतुः । उच्यते । सामर्थ्यादवधारणमाश्रीयते तत्रैवोपलब्धेरिति । अवयवस्तत्रैवोपलभ्यते ऽनवयवस्तु तत्र चान्यत्र च ॥ ननु वकारस्य वनव्रणवृ[3]क्षादिषूपलब्धिर्न चासावनवयवः । नैष दोषः । भिन्नसमुदायविषयं वर्णान्तरमेव तदिति शकुनिभाष्ये प्रतिपादितम् ॥............अस्तु तर्हीति ॥ कार्यलक्षणाय केवलमनुबन्ध उपा-

2. Ms. °षेधे; but cf. below and Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 55. 3. Ms. वनब्रह्मणवृक्षा°.

नेकान्ते **वृत्तिविशेषः** । यद्यनेकान्तो वृत्तिविशेषो न सिध्यति । किति णितीति कार्याणि न सिध्यन्ति । किं हि स तस्येद्भवति येनेत्कृतं स्यात् । एवं **तर्ह्यनन्तरः** । अनन्तर इति चेत्पूर्वोत्तरयोरित्कृतप्रसङ्गः । अनन्तर इति चेत्पूर्वोत्तरयोरित्कृतं प्राप्नोति । वुञ्छण् । **सिद्धं तु व्यवसितपाठात्** । सिद्धमेतत् । कथम् । व्यवसितपाठः कर्तव्यः । वुञ् छण् । स चावश्यं कर्तव्य इतरथा ह्येकान्तेऽपि संदेहः । अक्रियमाणे व्यवसितपाठ एकान्तेऽपि संदेहः स्यात् । तत्र न ज्ञायते किमयं पूर्वस्य भवत्याहोस्वित्परस्येति । संदेहमात्रमेतद्भवति सर्वसंदेहेषु चेदमुपतिष्ठते **व्याख्यानतो** विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि संदेहादलक्षणमिति पूर्वस्येति व्याख्यास्यामः । **वृत्ताद्वा** । वृत्ताद्वा सिद्धमेतत् । वृद्धिमन्तमाद्युदात्तं दृष्ट्वा ञिदिति व्यवसेयमन्तोदात्तं दृष्ट्वा किदिति । युक्तं पुनर्यद्वृत्तिनिमित्तको नामानुबन्धः स्यान्नानुबन्धनिमित्तकेन नाम वृत्तेन भवितव्यम् । वृत्तिनिमित्तक एवानुबन्धो वृत्तज्ञो ह्याचार्योऽनुबन्धानासज्जति[1] ॥ उभयमिदमनुबन्धेषूक्तमेकान्ता अनेकान्ता इति । किमत्र न्याय्यम् । एकान्ता इत्येव न्याय्यम् । कुत एतत् । अत्र हि हेतुर्व्यपदिष्टो यच्च नाम सहेतुकं तन्न्याय्यम् । ननु चोक्तं तत्रासरू-

---

त्तो न तु तस्यावयवः ॥ वृत्तिविशेष इति ॥ बहुव्रीहिर्न सिध्यति । अनेकान्तत्वे क इद्यस्येति संबन्धाभावात् ॥ अनन्तर इति ॥ यद्यप्यनन्तरादिषु बहुव्रीहिर्न भवति तथापीह वचनसामर्थ्याद्भवति ॥ व्यवसितपाठादिति ॥ व्यवसितानां विच्छिन्नानां पाठः कर्तव्यस्ततः पूर्वस्यैवासावनन्तरो न तु परस्य कालव्यवधानात् ॥ व्याख्यानत इति ॥ एकान्तपक्ष एको ऽवयवो द्वयोर्न भवतीति संदेहे व्याख्यानान्निश्चयः । अनेकान्तत्वे त्वानन्तर्यस्योभयापेक्षस्य विरोधाभावाद्व्यवसितपाठ[2] एव कर्तव्यः ॥ वृत्ताद्वेति ॥ वृत्तं प्रयोगः । नन्वाचार्यो भवतु वृत्तज्ञः शिष्यास्तु कथं प्रतिपद्यन्ते[3] । व्याख्यानाच्चेति पूर्वमेवैतदुक्तं वृत्ताद्वेत्यनेन किं तदेवोच्यते । नैष दोषः । पूर्वं हेतुरहितं[4] व्याख्यानमुक्तं वृत्ताद्वेत्यनेन तु हेतुरुच्यते । तस्मिन्प्रतिपन्ने साध्यं स्वय-

1 Ms. ऽनुबन्ध्याना°. 2. Ms. विरोधाभाषाववाद्यवसित.° 3. Ms. प्रतिपद्यते.
4. Ms. °रहितां.

पसर्वादेशदाप्प्रतिषेधेषु पृथक्त्वानिर्देशोऽनाकारान्तत्वादिति । असरूपविधौ तावन्न दोषः । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति नानुबन्धकृतमसारूप्यं भवतीति यदयं ददातिदधात्योर्विभाषां शास्ति । यदप्युक्तं सर्वादेश इति तन्नाप्याचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति नानुबन्धकृतमनेकाल्त्वं भवतीति यदयं शित्सर्वस्य [ १. १. ५५. ] इत्याह । यदप्युक्तं दाप्प्रतिषेधे पृथक्त्वनिर्देशः कर्तव्य इति न कर्तव्यः । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति नानुबन्धकृतमनेजन्तत्वं भवतीति यदयमुदीचां माङो व्यतीहारे [ ३. ४. १९. ] इति मेङः सानुबन्धकस्यात्त्वभूतस्य ग्रहणं करोति ॥

मेववैति । भाष्यकारेण वा तदुक्तमिदं तु वार्त्तिककारेण ॥ मेङ इति ॥ यद्यप्यनेकान्तपक्षस्यापि ज्ञापकमेतद्व्याख्यातुं युज्यते तथापि हेतुरहितत्वादिहानेकान्तपक्षो भाष्यकृता त्यक्तः । प्रदेशान्तरे त्वनेकान्तपक्षेणापि व्यवह्रियते सिद्धमनुबन्धस्यानेकान्तत्वादिति ॥

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ VI.[1]

Now one might say: 'As (the Anubandhas) are part (of that to which they are attached, terms like औश् etc. in P. VII., 1, 21 etc. contain more than one letter and therefore) it results (by the first portion अनेकाल् of P. I., 1, 55) already from (this) their containing more letters than one that औश् etc. are substituted for the whole (of that for which they are substitutes); consequently the word शित् in P. I., 1, 55 (which is intended to teach that that which

1. It has been stated in the Bhâshya on P. I., 3, 9, that three objections may be raised against the view that the Anubandhas are part of that to which they are attached, and in the same place it has also been shown how those objections may be removed by the assumption of three Paribhâshâs. Nâgojîbhaṭṭa proceeds therefore to give in P. VI., VII., VIII. the three Paribhâshâs mentioned in the Bhâshya on P. I., 3, 9.

has the Anubandha श् is substituted for the whole of that of which it is a substitute) is (wholly)[1] useless.' (The author of the Paribhâshâs) says therefore :

P. VI : (That which, when destitute of Anubandhas, consists of only one letter, must) not (be considered) to contain more letters than one when (one or more) Anubandhas are attached to it.[2]

The very word शित् (in P. I., 1, 55 which would be superfluous if this Paribhâshâ did not exist) indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ).[3] Accordingly such (substitutes) as तृ for अर्वन् in P. VI., 4, 127 etc. are not substituted for the whole (अर्वन् etc. but only by P. I., 1, 52 for the final letter न् etc.).

1. That शित् is not necessary for P. VI., 4, 119 may be seen in the Bhâshya etc. The Lopa taught in P. VI., 4, 119 is substituted for the whole reduplicative syllable of दा etc., not because it has the Anubandha श्, but because the word लोप which would be valid from VI., 4, 118 is repeated in VI., 4, 119.

2. P. : अनुबन्धकृतमनेकाल्त्वं नाश्रयणीयमिति परिभाषार्थः । एवमग्रेऽपि । (Viz. in P. VII. and VIII.)

3. After the existence of this Paribhâshâ has thus been established, terms like ओश् must in accordance with the Paribhâshâ be regarded to contain only one letter; they consequently fall no longer under the first portion अनेकाल् of P. I., 1, 55, and we can learn only from the word शित् of that rule that they are substituted for the whole of that for which they are substitutes. So long as Paribhâshâ VI. does not exist, शित् in P. I., 1, 55 is *vyartha i. e.* meaningless and superfluous ; but as soon as the Paribhâshâ has been established, शित् becomes *charitârtha i. e.* significant and necessary.

With[1] regard, however, to (substitutes like) डा etc. (that take the place of the affix तिप् in the Periphrastic Future etc., the circum-

1. P. According to the above Paribhâshâ णल् which is a substitute for मिप् and for तिप् in the Perfect, consists of only one letter, for णल्, being taught P. III., 4, 82-4, is an affix and its initial ण् is therefore by P. I., 3, 7 an Anubandha. Consequently णल् should be substituted only for the final इ of मि and of ति. Nevertheless णल् is substituted for the whole मि and ति because its अ is considered to be contracted from अ+अ and thus to consist of more letters than one. The substitutes डा etc. on the other hand need not be regarded as contracted from डा+आ etc. for in their case another explanation is possible, viz. that which is given in the text. The आदि of डादि is intended to include शी in P. VII., 1, 17, शै in P. VII., 1, 39 etc.; डा, शी, and शै are not in Pâṇini's grammar put down as affixes, and their initials ड् and श् are therefore no Anubandhas. By being substituted for the whole original affixes, डा, शी and शै become affixes and their initial letters Anubandhas. ( Cf. Si. Kau. I., p. 96). The initials ड् and श् of डा, शी and शै cannot because they subsequently become Anubandhas be termed Anubandhas from the beginning. In णल् however the initial ण् is from the beginning an Anubandha because णल् has in Pâṇini's grammar been put down as an affix; Sîradeva and others are therefore wrong when they explain the substitution of णल् for the whole मि and ति in the same manner in which the case of डा etc. has been explained here.

Nâgojîbhaṭṭa in डादिविषये-सिद्धम् does not give his own view, but that of former grammarians, and he shows by employing the word तु 'however' after डादिविषये, that he does not approve of their view. In reality the ड् and श् of डा, शी and शै must from the very beginning be regarded as Anubandhas; डा is substituted for the whole ति because its आ is contracted from आ+आ and शी and शै take the place of the whole affixes of which they are substitutes, because they have the Anubandha श्. This is shown by Nâgojîbhaṭṭa elsewhere.

stance of their being substituted for the whole तिप् etc.) results from the order (in which the various grammatical operations take place. जा etc. are at first no affixes, and as their initial letters ड् etc. therefore are not by P. I., 3, 7 Anubandhas, जा etc. are substituted for the whole affixes तिप् etc. After this substitution has taken place, however, जा etc. have become affixes, and their initial ड् etc. are consequently Anubandhas by P. I., 3, 7, and they are dropped by P. I., 3, 9. जा etc. must be substituted for the whole तिप् etc.) because without their being substituted for the whole (तिप् etc., ड् etc.) would be no Anubandhas at all.

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ VII.

Now one might say: 'Even (when our first objection to Paribhâshâ V. has) thus (been removed by the assumption of Paribh. VI., there remains another objection to the view expressed in Paribh. V., viz. this: If the Anubandhas were part of that to which they are attached, the root) दैप् in which आ is (by P. VI., 1, 45) substituted (for ऐ) after the elision of (the Anubandha) प्, would (in the formation of the *Past Pass. Partic.* which we see *e. g.*) in अवदातं मुखम् 'a bright face' not by (the prohibition) अदाप् in P. I., 1, 20 be forbidden to be termed घु[1], because it would not have the form दाप्. So long, namely, as the letter प् remains, आ cannot (by P. VI., 1, 45) be substituted (for the ऐ of दैप्) because (the root) does not end in either ए or ओ or ऐ,[2] and when प् has been dropped (and when the substitution of आ has thus become

---

1. If दैप् were termed घु, P. VII., 4, 47 would apply to it.

2. The Pratyâhâra एच् denotes the vowels ए, ओ, ऐ and औ; there are however no roots ending in औ.

possible) the letter प् is no longer present.' (The author of the Paribhâshâs) says therefore :

P. VII : (A root which, when destitute of Anubandhas, ends in either ए or ओ or ऐ, must) not (be considered) to have ceased to end in either ए or ओ or ऐ, when an Anubandha has been attached to it.[1]

(The fact that the root मे) has in P. III., 4, 19 been put down (as माङ्, with the Anubandha ङ्, and with the vowel आ instead of ए,) indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ). By the rule P. VI., 1, 45 आ is substituted for (the final of) that which in that form in which it is enunciated (in grammar) ends in ए or ओ or ऐ. (माङ् in P. III., 4, 19 has been formed according to this rule, and thereby the existence of Paribh. VII. is established; did this Paribhâshâ not exist) माङ् (in P. III., 4, 19) would be incorrect, for the substitution of आ would not apply (to मेङ्) because (this root), so long as the letter ङ् remains, would not end in either ए or ओ or ऐ.[2] Nor (can one object) that the substitution of आ (for the ए of मेङ्) cannot take place (even if by the Paribhâshâ मेङ् has to be consi-

1. By this Paribhâshâ दैप् must be regarded as ending in ऐ, and as therefore आ may be substituted for the vowel ऐ even while प् remains, दैप् does assume the form दाप् and is consequently by the prohibition अदाप् in P. I., 1, 20 forbidden to be termed घु.

2. The reading तस्य तदर्थज्ञापकतासंगतिः ought to be explained: 'that (Nirdes'a माङ् in P. III., 4, 19) is in harmony with the fact of its indicating the sense expressed by this (Paribhâshâ)' *i. e.* it would be improper if it did not indicate the existence of this Paribhâshâ.

dered as ending in ए), on the ground that मे in this form (मेङ् *i. e.* so long as its Anubandha remains) is no root[1] (and does therefore not fall under P. VI., 1, 45 which applies only to roots); for it has elsewhere been fully stated, that the word धातोः 'of a root' of P. VI., 1, 8 is no longer valid[2] in P. VI., 1, 45.—And this (statement that the existence of Paribh. VII. is indicated by माङ् in P. III., 4, 19) is found in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 20.[3]

---

1. *Scil.* because according to the Bhâshya and Kaiyaṭa on P. I., 1, 4 the term धातु 'root' applies only after the Anubandhas have been dropped.

2. P: P. VI., 1, 45 does not apply to words like गौ and to the first part of words like ग्लैकिता because these words and parts of words are not taught (उप दिश्) in works on grammar; nor does it apply to the termination of the 3 *Pers. Plur. Perf. Âtm.* इरे etc., which are taught in grammar, because इरे etc. cannot be followed by any affixes. Besides the fact that Pâṇini in III., 4, 81 actually puts down the affixes एश् and इरेच् as containing the vowel ए (which vowel, one should have thought, would have resulted from P. III., 4, 79) does not merely indicate (as Bhaṭṭojî. Si. Kau. II., p. 24 assumes) that P. III., 4, 79 does not apply to the substitutes for the terminations त—महिङ् (given in III., 4, 78), but it indicates also (according to the maxim यावता विनानुपपत्तिस्तावतो ज्ञाप्यत्वम् *i. e.* 'all that, without which there would be any incorrectness' in Pâṇini's rules, 'ought to be indicated' by a Jnâpaka) that their ए is not liable to be changed to आ by P. VI., 1, 45.—Cf. also the Bhâshya on P. VI., 1, 45: तस्मात्प्रातिपदिकानां प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः | धात्वधिकारात्प्रातिपदिकस्याप्राप्तिः | धात्वधिकारात्प्रातिपदिकस्यात्त्वं न भविष्यति | धातोरिति वर्तते | क्व प्रकृतम् | लिटि धातोरनभ्यासस्येति | अथापि निवृत्तम् | एवमप्यदोषः | उपदेश इत्युच्यते | उद्देशश्च प्रातिपदिकानां नोपदेशः ||; Kaiyaṭa on the last words: उद्देशश्चेति || उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानीति भाव इत्यादि ||.—Bhâshya on P. VI., 1, 8: तदेतद्धातुग्रहणं सान्यासिकं तिष्ठतु तावत् ||

3. Also in the Bhâshya on P. I., 3, 9.

alternatives have been considered): 'correct is only that (alternative) according to which the Anubandhas are part (of that to which they are attached)'; this[1] then is the point of view (from which we have to look at the whole question).

1. Both the greater simplicity of the second alternative which results from its not necessitating the assumption of metaphors, and the reason brought forward in support of it ('for in grammar we do find them etc.') prove the correctness of this alternative.

---

Extract from the Bhâshya[1] on P. I., 3, 9:

अथ यस्यानुबन्ध आसज्यते किं स तस्यैकान्तो भवत्याहोस्विदनेकान्तः । एकान्तस्तत्रोपलब्धेः । एकान्त इत्याह । कुतः । तत्रोपलब्धेः । तत्रस्थो ह्यसावुपलभ्यते । तद्यथा वृक्षस्था शाखा वृक्षैकान्तोपलभ्यते ॥ तत्रासरूपसर्वादेशदाप्प्रतिषेधेषु[2] पृथक्त्वनिर्देशोऽनाकारान्तत्वात् । तत्रासरूपाविधौ दोषो भवति । कर्मण्यण् [ ३. २. १. ] आतोऽनुपसर्गे कः [ ३. २. ३. ] इति काविषयेऽण्णपि प्राप्नोति । सर्वादेशे च दोषो भवति । दिव औत्सर्वादेशः प्राप्नोति [ ७. १. ८४. ]। दाप्प्रतिषेधे पृथक्त्वनिर्देशः कर्तव्यः । अदाब्दैपाविति वक्तव्यम् । किं पुनः कारणं न सिध्यति । अनाकारान्तत्वात् । ननु चात्त्वे कृते भविष्यति । तच्चात्त्वं न प्राप्नोति । किं कारणम् । अनेजन्तत्वात् ॥ अस्तु तर्ह्यनेकान्तः । अ-

1. Extract from Kaiyaṭa on the above: एकान्तस्तत्रोपलब्धेरिति ॥ ननु यदेव संशयमितिनिमित्तं स एव कथं निश्चयहेतुः । उच्यते । सामर्थ्यादवधारणमाश्रीयते तत्रैवोपलब्धेरिति । अवयवस्तत्रैवोपलभ्यते ऽनवयवस्तु तत्र चान्यत्र च ॥ ननु वकारस्य वनव्रणवृं[3]क्षादिषूपलब्धिर्न चासावनवयवः । नैष दोषः । भिन्नसमुदायविषयं वर्णान्तरमेव तदिति शकुनिभाष्ये प्रतिपादितम् ॥..........अस्तु तर्हीति ॥ कार्यलक्षणाय केवलमनुबन्ध उपा-

2. Ms. °षेधे; but cf. below and Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 55. 3. Ms. वनब्रह्मणवृक्षा°.

नेकान्ते **वृत्तिविशेषः** । यद्यनेकान्तो वृत्तिविशेषो न सिध्यति । किति णिती ति कार्याणि न सिध्यन्ति । किं हि स तस्येद्भवति येनेत्कृतं स्यात् । एवं **तर्ह्यनन्तरः** । अनन्तर इति चेत्पूर्वोत्तरयोरित्कृतप्रसङ्गः । अनन्तर इति चेत्पूर्वोत्तरयोरित्कृतं प्राप्नोति । वुञ्छण् । सिद्धं तु **व्यवसितपाठात्** । सिद्धमेतत् । कथम् । व्यवसितपाठः कर्तव्यः । वुञ् छण् । स चावश्यं कर्तव्य इतरथा ह्येकान्तेऽपि संदेहः । अक्रियमाणे व्यवसितपाठ एकान्तेऽपि संदेहः स्यात् । तत्र न ज्ञायते किमयं पूर्वस्य भवत्याहोस्वित्परस्येति । संदेहमात्रमेतद्भवति सर्वसंदेहेषु चेदमुपतिष्ठते **व्याख्यानतो** विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि संदेहादलक्षणमिति पूर्वस्येति व्याख्यास्यामः । **वृत्ताद्वा** । वृत्ताद्वा सिद्धमेतत् । वृद्धिमन्तमाद्युदात्तं दृष्ट्वा ञिदिति व्यवसेयमन्तोदात्तं दृष्ट्वा किदिति । युक्तं पुनर्यद्वृत्तिनिमित्तको नामानुबन्धः स्यान्नानुबन्धनिमित्तकेन नाम वृत्तेन भवितव्यम् । वृत्तिनिमित्तक एवानुबन्धो वृत्तज्ञो ह्याचार्योऽनुबन्धानासज्जेति[1] ॥ उभयमिदमनुबन्धेषूक्तमेकान्ता अनेकान्ता इति । किमत्र न्याय्यम् । एकान्ता इत्येव न्याय्यम् । कुत एतत् । अत्र हि हेतुर्व्यपदिष्टो यच्च नाम सहेतुकं तन्न्याय्यम् । ननु चोक्तं तत्रासरू-

---

त्तो न तु तस्यावयवः ॥ वृत्तिविशेष इति ॥ बहुव्रीहिर्न सिध्यति । अनेकान्तत्वे क इद्यस्येति संबन्धाभावात् ॥ अनन्तर इति ॥ यद्यप्यनन्तरादिषु बहुव्रीहिर्न भवति तथापीह वचनसामर्थ्याद्भवति ॥ व्यवसितपाठादिति ॥ व्यवसितानां विच्छिन्नानां पाठः कर्तव्यस्ततः पूर्वस्यैवासावनन्तरो न तु परस्य कालव्यवधानात् ॥ व्याख्यानत इति ॥ एकान्तपक्ष एको ऽवयवो द्वयोर्न भवतीति संदेहे व्याख्यानान्निश्चयः । अनेकान्तत्वे त्वानन्तर्यस्योभयापेक्षस्य विरोधाभावाद्व्यवसितपाठे[2] एव कर्तव्यः ॥ वृत्ताद्वेति ॥ वृत्तं प्रयोगः । नन्वाचार्यो भवतु वृत्तज्ञः शिष्यास्तु कथं प्रतिपद्यन्ते[3] । व्याख्यानाच्चेति पूर्वमेवैतदुक्तं वृत्ताद्वेत्यनेन किं तदेवोच्यते । नैष दोषः । पूर्वं हेतुर्रहितं[4] व्याख्यानमुक्तं वृत्ताद्वेत्यनेन तु हेतुरुच्यते । तस्मिन्प्रतिपन्ने साध्यं स्वय-

1 Ms. ऽनुबन्ध्याना°. 2. Ms. विरोधाभाषाववाद्यवसित.° 3. Ms. प्रतिपद्यते.
4. Ms. °रहितां.

Extract from the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 20:[1]

दाप्प्रतिषेधे न दैप्यनेजन्तत्वात्। दाप्प्रतिषेधे दैपि प्रतिषेधो न प्राप्नोति। अवदातं मुखम्। ननु चात्त्वे कृते भविष्यति। तद्व्यात्त्वं न प्राप्नोति। किं कारणम्। अनेजन्तत्वात्। सिद्धमनुबन्धस्यानेकान्तत्वात्। सिद्धमेतत्। कथम्[2]। अनुबन्धा अनेकान्ताः॥ पित्प्रतिषेधाद्वा। अथवा दाधा घ्वापिदिति वक्ष्यामि। तच्चावश्यं वक्तव्यम्। अदाबिति ह्युच्यमान इहापि प्रसज्येत प्रणिदापयतीति॥ शक्यं तावदनेनादाबिति ब्रुवता बान्तस्य प्रतिषेधो विज्ञातुम्। सूत्रं तर्हि भिद्यते। यथान्यासमेवास्तु। ननु चोक्तं दाप्प्रतिषेधे न दैपीति। परिहृतमेतत्। सिद्धमनुबन्धस्यानेकान्तत्वादिति। अथैकान्तेषु दोष एव। एकान्तेषु च[3] न दोषः। आत्त्वे कृते भविष्यति। ननु चोक्तं तद्व्यात्त्वं न प्राप्नोति किं कारणम् अनेजन्तत्वादिति। पकारलोपे कृते भविष्यति। न ह्ययं तदा दाब्भवति। भूतपूर्वगत्या भविष्यति। एतच्चात्र युक्तं यत्सर्वेष्वेव सानुबन्धकग्रहणेषु भूतपूर्वगतिर्विज्ञास्यते[4]। अनैमित्तिको ह्यनुबन्धलोपस्तावत्येव भवति॥ अथवाचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति नानुबन्धकृतमनेजन्तत्वं यदयमुदीचां माङो व्यतीहारे [३.४.१९.]

---

1. Kaiyaṭa: दाप्प्रतिषेध इति। दाप् लवन इत्यस्यैव निषेधः स्यादित्यर्थः॥ अवदातमिति। तत्त्वमत्र प्राप्नोति॥ शक्यं तावदिति। दाप्दैपौ धातुषु बान्तौ पठितव्यौ॥ तावत्येवेति। इत्संज्ञायां सत्यामेव। प्रयोगे दाशब्द एवायं पित्कार्यं तु लभत इत्यर्थः॥ अथवेति। अनुबन्धानामेकान्तत्वपक्ष उपदेश एजन्तानामात्त्वमुच्यमानं दैपो न प्राप्नोतीति ज्ञापकोपन्यासः। माङ इति मेङो ग्रहणं न माङो मेङो व्यतीहारेण नित्ययोगान्माङस्तु विवक्षावशाद्व्यतिमिमीत इति कादाचित्कत्वाद्व्यतिहारयोगस्य। प्रणिदानं व्यतिहार इत्येकोऽर्थः। उदीचां मेङ इति.

2. Ed. कथम्। अनुबन्धस्यानेकान्तत्वात्। अनेकान्ता°. 3. Ed. एकान्तेष्वपि. 4. Ed. विज्ञायते.

इति मेङः सानुबन्धकस्यात्त्वभूतस्य ग्रहणं करोति ॥ अथवा दावेवायं न दैवास्ति । कथमवदायतीति । श्यान्विकरणेनै भविष्यति ॥

---

तु न कृतम् । एवं हि नानुबन्धकृतमिति न ज्ञापितं स्यात् ॥ अथवेति । दिवादिषु दाप् शो-षन इति पठिष्यत इत्यर्थः ॥

1. Ed. श्यन्विकरणो.

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ VIII.

Now one might say: 'Even thus (there remains the following objection to Paribhâshâ V.: If the Anubandhas were part of that to which they are attached, the affixes अण् and क in which ण् and क् are Anubandhas, would differ in form, and consequently the affix) अण् (of P. III., 2, 1 would not be entirely superseded by the affix क of P. III., 2, 3, but it) would by the rule P. III., 1, 94 (according to which an affix taught in a special rule supersedes an affix taught in a general rule only optionally if both affixes are unlike each other in form) be added also wherever the affix क (of P. III., 2, 3 etc.) is added, (and the result hereof would be the formation of incorrect forms.' The author of the Paribhâshâs) says therefore:

P. VIII: (Affixes which, when destitute of Anubandhas, have the same form, must) not (be considered) to differ in form when (different) Anubandhas have been attached to them.

The circumstance that (the word विभाषा 'optionally' in) P. III., 1, 139 teaches that (the affix) श (of P. III., 1, 139) which supersedes the affix ण (of P. III., 1, 141) does so (only) optionally,

indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ).[1] Accordingly (the affix) अण् (of P. III., 2, 1) is not added (where the affix क of P. III., 2, 3 is added which latter is the case) *e. g.* in गोद; (consequently गोदाय cannot be formed by P. III., 2, 1). This is found in the Bhâshya on P. III., 1, 94.[2]

1. If ण and श did differ in form, the word विभाषा in P. III., 1, 139 would be superfluous, because in that case it would follow already from P. III., 1, 94 that श supersedes ण only optionally.—See also Si. Kau. II., p. 301.
2. Also in the Bhâshya on P. I., 3, 9.

---

Bhâshya on P. III. 1, 94 :[1]

वासरूपोऽस्त्रियाम् ॥ कथमिदं विज्ञायते । स्त्रियामभिधेयायां वासरूपो न भवतीत्याहोस्वित्स्त्रीप्रत्ययेष्विति । किं चातः । यदि विज्ञायते स्त्रियामभिधेयायामिति लव्या लवितव्यान्न वासरूपो न प्राप्नोति । अथ विज्ञायते स्त्रीप्रत्ययेष्विति व्यावक्रोशी व्यवकृष्टिरिति न सिध्यति । एवं तर्हि नैवं विज्ञायते स्त्रियामभिधेयायां नापि स्त्रीप्रत्ययेष्विति । कथं तर्हि । स्त्रीग्रहणं स्वरयिष्यते । तत्र स्वरितेनाधिकारगतिर्भवतीति स्त्रियामित्यधिकृत्य ये प्रत्यया विहितास्तेषां प्रतिषेधो विज्ञास्यते ॥

किमर्थं पुनरिदमुच्यते । असरूपस्य वावचनमुत्सर्गस्य बाधकविषयेऽनिवृत्त्यर्थम् । असरूपस्य वावचनं क्रियत उत्सर्गस्य बाधकविषयेऽनिवृत्तिर्यथा स्यात् । तव्यत्तव्यानीयर उत्सर्गास्तेषामजन्ताद्यदपवादः [ ३.

---

1. Kaiyaṭa: कथमिति ॥ स्त्रियामित्यभिधेयसप्तमी वा स्यात्स्त्रियामित्यस्यैव वा स्वरूपस्य निर्देशः स्यात्स्त्रियामित्युच्चार्य ये प्रत्यया विधीयन्ते तेषु वासरूपो न भवतीति संदिहानः पृच्छति ॥ लव्येति ॥ अचो यत् [ ३. १. ९७. ] इति यता तव्यादीनां नित्यं बाधनं प्राप्नोतीत्यर्थः ॥ व्यावक्रोशीति ॥ कर्मव्यतिहारे णच् स्त्रियाम् [ ३. ३. ४३ ] इति णचा क्तिनो बाधः प्राप्नोतीत्यर्थः ॥ स्त्रियामित्यधिकृत्येति ॥ स्त्रियां क्तिन् [ ३. ३. ९४ ] इत्य-

१. ९६; ९७]। चेयम्। चेतव्यमित्यपि यथा स्यात्। नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम्। अजन्ताद्यद्विधीयते। हलन्ताण्ण्यद्विधीयते [३. १. १२४]। एतावन्तश्च धातवो यदुताजन्ता हलन्ताश्च। उच्यन्ते च तव्यदादयस्ते वचनाद्भविष्यन्ति॥ एवं तर्हि ण्वुल्तृचावुत्सर्गौ तयोः पचादिभ्योऽजपवादः [३. १. १३३; १३४]। पचतीति पचः। पक्ता पाचक इत्यपि यथा स्यात्। एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम्। वक्ष्ये ह्येतदजपि सर्वधातुभ्यो वक्तव्य इति॥ एवं तर्हि ण्वुल्तृजच उत्सर्गास्तेषामिगुपधात्कोऽपवादः [३. १. १३३–५]। विक्षिपो विलिखः। विक्षेप्ता विक्षेपक इत्यपि यथा स्यात्॥ अस्ति प्रयोजनमेतत्। किं तर्हीति।

तत्रोत्पत्तिर्वा प्रसङ्गो यथा तद्धिते। तत्रोत्पत्तिर्विभाषा प्राप्नोति यथा तद्धिते। अस्तु। यदा विक्षिपो विलिख इत्येतन्न तदा विक्षेप्ता विक्षेपक इत्येतद्भविष्यति। यद्येतल्लभ्येत कृतं स्यात्। तत्तु न लभ्यम्। किं कारणम्। यथा तद्धित इत्युच्यते तद्धितेषु च सर्वमेवोत्सर्गापवादं विभाषोत्पद्यते वा न वा॥ सिद्धं त्वसरूपस्य वाधकस्य वावाधकवचनात्। सिद्धमेतत्। कथम्। असरूपस्य वाधकस्य वावाधकवचनात्। असरू-

---

स्मिन्स्त्र्यधिकारे य उत्सर्गापवादास्तेष्वपवाद उत्सर्गस्य वाधक एवेत्यर्थः॥ तत्रोत्पत्तिर्वा प्रसङ्ग इति॥ वासरूप इत्येतावच्छ्रूयते। तत्र वाग्रहणेन किं भावो विकल्प्यताम्। असरूपोऽपवादो वा भवति पक्षे न भवतीति। अथ वाधकत्वं विकल्प्यताम्। वा वाधको भवति पक्षे न वाधक इति। तत्रान्तरङ्गत्वात्सत्ताया एव विकल्पः स्याद्यथोक्तं यत्रान्यत्क्रियापदं न श्रूयते तत्रास्तिर्भवति पर इति न तु बहिरङ्गस्य वाधकत्वस्येत्युत्पत्तेरेव विकल्पः स्यात्पक्षे तु न कश्चित्प्रत्यय उत्पद्येतेत्यर्थः॥ अस्त्विति॥ वाधकाभाव उत्सर्गस्यानिवार्यत्वादिति भावः॥ यद्येतदिति॥ अपवादशास्त्रेणोत्सर्गशास्त्रस्य वाधितत्वादपवादाभावपक्षेऽप्युत्सर्गस्याप्रवर्तनादिति भावः। तत्र यथात इञ् [४. १. ९५] इति विकल्पितेनेञा मुक्ते पक्षेऽण् न भवत्यपि तु वाक्यमेव तथेहाप्यपवादाभावपक्षे प्रकृतिरेव कर्त्रादीनर्थानभिदध्याद्यथाग्निचिदित्यादौ क्विबादिलोपे कृते॥ सिद्धं त्विति॥ वाधकत्वे विकल्पिते यत्र पक्षे ऽपवादस्य वाधकत्वं

पो बाधको वा बाधको भवतीति वक्तव्यं सिध्यति । सूत्रं तर्हि भिद्यते । यथान्यासमेवास्तु । ननु चोक्तं तत्रोत्पत्तिर्वा प्रसङ्गो यथा तद्धित इति । नैष दोषः । अस्ति कारणं येन तद्धितेषु विभाषोत्पत्तिर्भवति । किं कारणम् । प्रकृतिस्तत्र प्रकृत्यर्थे वर्ततेऽन्येन च शब्देन प्रत्ययार्थोऽभिधीयते । इह पुनर्न केवला प्रकृतिः प्रकृत्यर्थे वर्तते न चान्यः शब्दोऽस्ति यस्तमर्थमभिदधीतेति कृत्वानुत्पत्तिर्न भविष्यति ॥ अथवा समयः कृतो न केवला प्रकृतिः प्रयोक्तव्या न च केवलः प्रत्यय इति । एतस्मात्समयादनुत्पत्तिर्न भविष्यति । य एव तस्य समयस्य कर्ता स एवेदमप्याह । यद्यसौ तत्र प्रमाणमिहापि प्रमाणं भवितुमर्हति । प्रमाणमसौ तत्र चेह च । सामर्थ्यं त्विह द्रष्टव्यं शब्दानां प्रयोगे न चानुत्पत्तौ सामर्थ्यमस्ति । तेनानुत्पत्तिर्न भविष्यति । कथं तर्हि तद्धितेष्वनुत्पत्तौ सामर्थ्यं भवति । अन्येन प्रत्ययेन सामर्थ्यम् । केन । षष्ठ्या ॥ अथवा रूपवत्तामयमाश्रित्य वाविधिरुच्यते न चानुत्पत्ती रूपवती तेनानुत्पत्तिर्न भ-

---

नास्ति तत्र बाधकाभावादुत्सर्गः प्रवर्तते ॥ अन्येनेति ॥ दक्षस्यापत्यमित्यादावपत्यादिशब्देनेत्यर्थः ॥ इह पुनरिति ॥ केवला प्रकृतिः स्वार्थमपि नाभिधत्ते किं पुनः कर्त्रादिकमर्थमभिधास्यति । तथा हि । प्रकृतिप्रत्ययसमुदाये प्रयुज्यमानेऽन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां प्रकृतिः प्रकृत्यर्थे वर्तते प्रत्ययस्तु प्रत्ययार्थ इत्युच्यते । अनुत्पन्नप्रत्यया तु प्रकृतिर्न कंचिदर्थं गमयति । यथापि हि क्षिपेः कर्तेति कर्त्रादिशब्दाः प्रयुज्यन्ते तथापि करोतिक्रियापेक्षमपि कर्तृत्वं प्रतीयेत न तु क्षिपिक्रियापेक्षमेव । तस्मात्सामर्थ्याद्बाधकत्वं बहिरङ्गमपि विकल्प्यते ॥ य एवेति ॥ समयस्यायं बाधकोऽस्त्विति भावः ॥ सामर्थ्यमिति ॥ अर्थप्रत्यायनाय शब्दाः प्रयुज्यन्ते न च प्रत्ययस्यानुत्पत्तावर्थः प्रत्याययितुं शक्य इत्यर्थः । पूर्वस्मिन्परिहारे प्रकृतेरेव केवलायाः स्वार्थमात्राभिधानेऽपि सामर्थ्यं नास्तीत्युक्तम् । उत्तरत्र तु समयात्प्रयोग एव केवलाया नास्तीत्युच्यते ॥ कथं तर्हीति ॥ समयात्केवलस्य प्रातिपदिकस्य तद्धितानुत्पत्तौ साधुत्वं न प्राप्नोतीत्यर्थः ॥ अन्येनेति ॥ दक्षस्यापत्यमिति षष्ठ्यन्तस्य प्रातिपदिकस्य प्रयोगो न केवलस्य प्रातिपदिकस्येह तु कृदनुत्पत्तौ सत्यां केवल एव धातुः स्यात्तस्य च समयात्प्रयोगाभावः ॥ अथवेति ॥ असरूपशब्देन भिन्नरूप उच्यते तस्य

विष्यति ॥ एवमपि कुत एतदपवादो विभाषा भविष्यति न पुनरुत्सर्ग इति । न चैवास्ति विशेषो यदपवादो वा विभाषा स्यादुत्सर्गो वा । अपि च सापेक्षोऽयं निर्देशः क्रियते वासरूप इति । न चोत्सर्गवेलायां किंचिदपेक्ष्यमस्त्यपवादवेलायां पुनरुत्सर्गोऽपेक्ष्यते । तेन यो रूपवानन्यपूर्वो बाधकः प्राप्नोति स वा बाधको भविष्यति । कः पुनरसौ । अपवादः ॥

यदि यो रूपवानन्यपूर्वो बाधकः प्राप्नोति स वा बाधको भवतीत्युच्यते क्तिबादिषु समावेशो न प्राप्नोति । ग्रामणीः ग्रामणाय इति । न ह्येते रूपवन्तः । एतेऽपि रूपवन्तः । कस्यामवस्थायाम् । उपदेशावस्थायाम् ॥ यद्येवमनुबन्धभिन्नेषु विभाषाप्रसङ्गः । अनुबन्धभिन्नेषु विभाषा प्राप्नोति । कर्मण्यण् आतोऽनुपसर्गे क इति कविषयेऽण्णपि प्राप्नोति । सिद्धमनुबन्धस्यानेकान्तत्वात् । सिद्धमेतत् । कथम् । अनुबन्धस्यानेकान्तत्वात् । अनेकान्ता अनुबन्धाः ॥ अथवा प्रयोगेऽसरूपाणां वाविधिर्न्याय्यः । प्रयोगे लादेशेषु प्रतिषेधः । प्रयोगे लादेशेषु प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । ह्योऽपचदित्यत्र लुङपि प्राप्नोति । श्वः पक्तेत्यत्र लृडपि प्राप्नोति । नैष दोषः । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति न लादेशेषु वासरूपो भवतीति यदयं हशश्वतोर्लङ्चेत्याह । अथवा प्रयोगेऽसरूपाणां वाविधौ न सर्वमिष्टं संगृहीतमिति कृत्वा द्वितीयः प्रयोग उपास्यते । कोऽसौ । उप-

---

च भिन्नरूपत्वं रूपवदुत्सर्गापेक्षया भवतीति स एव पक्षेऽभ्यनुज्ञायते न त्वरूपानुत्पत्तिरित्यर्थः ॥ न चैवास्तीति ॥ उत्सर्गविकल्पेऽप्राप्तविभाषापवादविकल्पे तु प्राप्तविभाषेति न कश्चिद्विशेषः ॥ अपवादवेलायामिति ॥ बाध्यत्वेन यावदुत्सर्गो नापेक्ष्यते तावदपवादस्य प्रवृत्तिरेव नास्तीत्यर्थः ॥ उपदेशावस्थायामिति ॥ प्रत्यासत्तिन्यायादुपदेशावस्थायामसारूप्यमाश्रीयत इत्यर्थः ॥ ह्योऽपचदिति ॥ लङ्घनचक्रस्तकारप्रत्ययो लुङि त्वपाक्षीदितीच्छब्द इति भिन्नरूपत्वात्समावेशप्रसङ्गः ॥ यदयमिति ॥ परोक्षे लिडिति लिटा लङः समावेशोऽसारूप्यात्सिद्ध एवेति नार्थो लङ्विधानेन विहितस्तु लकाराणामसमावेशं ज्ञापयतीत्यर्थः ॥ अ-

देशो नाम । उपदेशे चैतेऽसरूपाः ॥ ननु चोक्तमनुबन्धभिन्नेषु विभाषाप्रसङ्ग इति । परिहृतमेतत् । सिद्धमनुबन्धस्यानेकान्तत्वादिति । अथैकान्तेषु दोष एव । एकान्तेषु च न दोषः । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति नानुबन्धकृतमसारूप्यं भवतीति यदयं ददातिदधात्योर्विभाषां शास्ति ॥ अथवासरूपो वा बाधको भवतीत्युच्यते । अपवादश्च नामानुबन्धभिन्नो वा भवति रूपान्यत्वेन वा । तेनानेनावश्यं किंचित्त्याज्यं किंचिच्च संग्रहीतव्यम् । तद्यदनुबन्धकृतमसारूप्यं तन्नाश्रयितव्यं यत्तु रूपान्यत्वेनासारूप्यं तदाश्रयिष्यामः ॥ अथवासरूपो वा बाधको भवतीत्युच्यते । सर्वश्चासरूपः । तत्र प्रकर्षगतिर्विज्ञास्यते साधीयो योऽसरूप इति । कश्च साधीयः । यः प्रयोगे च प्राक्च प्रयोगात् ॥ अथवासरूपो वा बाधको भवतीत्युच्यते । न चैवं सति कश्चिदपि सरूपः । अत एवं[1] विज्ञास्यामः । क्वचिद्येऽसरूपा इति । अनुबन्धभिन्नाश्च प्रयोगे सरूपाः ॥

अथ कथमिदं विज्ञायतेऽस्त्रियामिति । किं स्त्रियां न भवतीत्याहोस्वित्प्राक् स्त्रिया भवतीति । कश्चात्र विशेषः । स्त्रियां प्रतिषेधे क्तल्युट्तुमुन्खलर्थेषु विभाषाप्रसङ्गः । स्त्रियां प्रतिषेधे क्तल्युट्तुमुन्खलर्थेषु विभाषा प्राप्नोति । क्त । हसितं छात्त्रस्य शोभनम् । घञपि प्राप्नोति । ल्युट् । हसनं छात्त्रस्य शोभनम् । घञपि प्राप्नोति । तुमुन् । इच्छति भोक्तुम् । लिङ्लोटावपि प्राप्नुतः । खलर्थः । ईषत्पानः सोमो भवता । खलपि

---

थवेति ॥ क्तिन्नादयो न संगृहीताः प्रयोगे तेषां रूपाभावादित्यर्थः ॥ क्वचिद्य इति ॥ प्रयोग इत्यर्थः । उपदेशे हि सर्वस्यैवासारूप्यमित्यसरूपग्रहणमनर्थकं स्यात् ॥ कथमिति ॥ स्त्र्यधिकारविहितेष्वेव किं प्रतिषेधः परस्तात्स्त्र्यधिकारस्य भवत्येव वासरूपविधिरथ स्त्र्यधिकारात्प्राग्वासरूपविधिर्भवति स्त्र्यधिकारेण विच्छिद्यत इति प्रश्नः ॥ लिङ्लोटाविति ॥ लिङ् च [३. ३.१५९] इति लिङ् भवत्येव । इच्छार्थेषु लिङ्लोटौ [३. ३. १५७] इत्यत्र लिङ्लोटोः सहनिर्देशादत्रापि सहनिर्देशः कृतः । लिङ् चेति नियमाल्लोण् न भविष्यती-

1. Ms. सरूपः त एवं.

प्राप्नोति ॥ एवं तर्हि स्त्रियाः प्रागिति वक्ष्यामि । स्त्रियाः प्रागिति चेत्क्त्वायां वावचनम् । स्त्रियाः प्रागिति चेत्क्त्वायां वावचनं कर्तव्यम् । आसित्वा भुङ्क्ते । आस्यते भोक्तुमित्यपि यथा स्यात् । कालादिषु तुमुन्विधाने वावचनम् [३. ३. १६७] । कालादिषु तुमुन्विधाने वावचनं कर्तव्यम् । कालो भोक्तुम् । कालो भोजनस्येत्यपि यथा स्यात् । अर्हे तृज्विधानम् । अर्हे तृज्विधेयः । इमेऽर्हे कृत्या विधीयन्ते । ते विशेषविहिताः सामान्यविहितं तृचं बाधेरन् । नैष दोषः । भावकर्मणोः कृत्या विधीयन्ते कर्तरि तृच् । कः प्रसङ्गो यद्भावकर्मणोः कृत्याः कर्तरि तृचं बाधेरन् । एवं तर्ह्यर्हे कृत्यतृज्विधानम् । अर्हे कृत्यतृचो विधेयाः । अयमर्हे लिङ् विधीयते स विशेषविहितः सामान्यविहितान्कृत्यतृचो बाधेत ॥

ति शक्यते वक्तुम् । ननु तुमुन् भावे कर्तृकर्मणोर्लिङ्लोटाविति भिन्नार्थत्वात्कुतो बाध्यबाधकभावः । नैष दोषः । भावेऽपि लिङ्लोटोरस्ति विधानमिति तदपेक्षया बाध्यबाधकभावोऽभिमतः ॥ आस्यते भोक्तुमिति ॥ भोजनार्थत्वादासनस्य पौर्वकाल्यमत्र गम्यत इति समानविषयत्वाद्बाध्यबाधकभावप्रसङ्गः । क्त्वाभावे तत्रैव च लकारोत्पत्तिरस्त्वेति समानार्थत्वमपि विद्यते ॥ तत्रायं निर्णयः । स्त्र्यधिकारस्य परस्तादपि वासरूपस्य विधिर्भवति । अर्हे कृत्यतृचश्च [३.३.१६९] इत्यत्र तु कृत्यतृज्ग्रहणेन तस्यानित्यत्वं ज्ञाप्यते ॥.—

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ IX.

There is a maxim that, whenever it may appear doubtful whether an operation has reference to that which is expressed by the technical or to that which is expressed by the ordinary meaning of a particular term, the operation refers (only) to that which is expressed by the technical meaning of the term in question. It is founded on the consideration that the attending circumstances have the power of restricting a word to a particular

meaning.[1] According to this maxim, one might suppose, the word संख्या 'numeral' ought, whenever it is employed (in grammar), to denote only the words बहु etc. (which are termed संख्या by P. I., 1, 23) but not the words एक 'one,' द्वि 'two' etc. which are ordinarily known as numerals; in (Pâṇini's grammar) namely with which we are concerned here, बहु etc. have been technically termed संख्या 'numeral,' and the knowledge of this

---

1. The word सैन्धव has the two meanings 'salt' and 'a horse'; but if a person, while eating, says सैन्धवमानय, this sentence can only mean 'bring salt', and not 'bring the horse'. The Naiyâyikas, as may be seen from Muktâvali (pag. 91 ed. Roer.) do not admit the restrictive power of the attending circumstances; '*Tâtparya*, intention, (they say) is the wish of the speaker. If the knowledge of the intention of the speaker were not a cause (of verbal knowledge), we should in instances like सैन्धवमानय not understand (by सैन्धव) sometimes 'horse,' and sometimes 'salt' (but both meanings would present themselves always together). And one cannot say that the attending circumstances etc. alone, as suggesting the meaning of the speaker, are the cause of verbal knowledge; for these (attending circumstances) have no restrictive power. (If a person, even while eating, says सैन्धवमानय, he need not necessarily mean 'bring salt,' but he may sometimes mean 'bring the horse'). But if one assumes that those (attending circumstances) have a restrictive power because they make one know the intention of the speaker, then it is less cumbrous to assume that the knowledge of the intention of the speaker itself is the cause (of verbal knowledge)'.—According to the opinion of the Vedântists (as given in the Vedântaparibhâshâ chapter IV.) *Tâtparya* means simply 'the ability to convey a particular meaning.' This however must be further limited. Words like सैन्धव are able to convey two meanings; how can we then know that सैन्धवमानय is intended to denote 'bring salt'? सैन्धव denotes in this case 'salt' because 'it is not uttered with the desire of denoting any thing else than that (salt).'

should (restrict the meaning of संख्या in grammar to बहु etc. alone) just as the attending circumstances (restrict the meanings of words elsewhere). To reject such a supposition (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says :

P. IX : Here (in grammar a word) possesses both (its technical and its ordinary meaning ; viz. sometimes both in one and the same place, sometimes only the one, and sometimes only the other).

The prohibition (conveyed in the word अतिशदन्ता a numeral 'not ending in either ति or शत्') in P. V., 1, 22 indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ; for that prohibition can refer only to words like सप्तति 'seventy', चत्वारिंशत् 'forty' which are ordinarily called numerals) because there are no words ending in ति[1] or in शत् that are (only) technically termed numerals. (Consequently the term संख्या 'numeral' must denote in Pâṇini's grammar also[2] the ordinary numerals एक, द्वि etc). According to this (Paribhâshâ) we understand (*e. g.* by कर्मन्, करण, अधिकरण etc.) in P. I., 3, 14; III., 1, 17 ; II., 4, 13 etc. (not what those words express as

---

1. In कति, which is technically termed संख्या by P. I., 1, 23, the affix is अति, not ति.

2. The prohibition conveyed in अतिशदन्ता might also indicate that the term संख्या 'numeral' and other terms should in grammar be taken in their ordinary meaning *alone*, and not both in their technical *and* in their ordinary sense. However, if this were really indicated by अतिशदन्ता, the formation of technical terms like आम्रेडित etc. would be altogether useless, for they are in grammar employed *only* in their technical meaning. Therefore अतिशदन्ता can only indicate, that the words in grammar have, besides their technical, *also* their ordinary meaning.

grammatical terms, कर्तुरीप्सिततमं कारकम् etc., but only[1]) what they ordinarily denote, viz. 'action,' 'thing' etc. To determine in each case, where a word has both meanings, where it possesses only its ordinary and where only its technical meaning, we can have recourse only to the interpretation (of Patanjali and others which itself is) guided by the particular forms (that have to be derived from or to be accounted for by the rules in which the words in question occur). Only from this (interpretation of the learned do we know that) the word आम्रेडित has (in grammar) only the technical meaning (assigned to it in P. VIII., 1, 2) but does not mean 'anything sounded twice or three times'. —(All) this is found in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 23[2].—

---

1. उभयगतिः means namely: उभयोः कृत्रिमाकृत्रिमयोर्विषयभेदेनैकत्र विषये च गतिर्ग्रहणम्; *a.* sometimes only the technical meaning must be understood; *b.* sometimes only the ordinary meaning; *c.* sometimes both are understood in the same place; संख्या is an instance for *c.*, कर्मन् in P. I., 3, 14 etc for *b.*, कर्मन् in P. III., 4, 69 for *a.*

2. For there the suggestion that the word संख्या should be added to बहु, गण etc. in order that the term संख्या in grammar might denote also the ordinary numerals एक, द्वि, etc., has been rejected by means of this Paribhâshâ.

See the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 23; Ed. Ballantyne p. 419. Here only extracts: अक्रियमाणे हि संख्याग्रहण एकादिकायाः संख्यायाः संख्येत्येष संप्रत्ययो न स्यात्। किं कारणम्। अकृत्रिमत्वात्। बह्वादीनां कृत्रिमा संज्ञा। कृत्रिमाकृत्रिमयोः कृत्रिमे कार्यसंप्रत्ययो भवति ॥ .... यथैव तर्ह्यर्थात्प्रकरणाद्वा लोके कृत्रिमाकृत्रिमयोः कृत्रिमे कार्यसंप्रत्ययो भवत्येवमिहापि प्राप्नोति। जानाति ह्यसौ बह्वादीनामियं संज्ञा कृतेति। न यथा लोके तथा व्याकरणे। उभयगतिरिह[1] भवति। अन्यत्रापि नावश्यकमिहैव[2] ॥.... अथवाचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति भवत्येकादिकायाः संख्यायाः संख्यप्रदेशेषु संप्रत्यय इति यदयं संख्याया अतिशदन्तायाः कन्निति तिशदन्तायाः प्रतिषेधं शास्ति।...... अथवा मह-

1. Ed. उभयगतिः पुनरिह. 2. Ed. नावश्यमिहैव.

But[1] to suppose that (Pâṇini by defining the meaning of a technical term in a Saṃjnâ-rule) intended to restrict that term throughout his grammar to the meaning (which he assigns to it in the Saṃjnâ-rule in question, and then to maintain) that the maxim (which was mentioned above in the words) 'that whenever it may appear doubtful—term in question,' is based on this restrictive nature of the Saṃjnâ-rules, is not admissible. For as those (Saṃjnâ-rules), because they assign (to a particular word) a force which (that word) previously did not possess, may be considered to teach something (new), it is improper to regard them as intended to restrict (the force which a word previously was known to possess.[2] The objection that a Saṃjnâ-rule cannot assign to any word a force which that word previously did not possess because all words denote all meanings, is) likewise (futile, for) the tenet that all (words) denote all meanings accords with the views of those who have attained to an union with the supreme soul, but not with our views; for to know individually all words and meanings, is impossible, while a general[3] knowledge of this

---

तीयं संज्ञा क्रियते। संज्ञा च नाम यतो न लघीयः। कुत एतत्। लघ्वर्थं हि संज्ञाकरणम्। तत्र महत्याः संज्ञायाः करण एतत्प्रयोजनम्। अन्वर्थसंज्ञा यथा विज्ञायते। संख्यायतेऽनयेति संख्या। एकादिकया चापि संख्यायते॥

Kaiyaṭa on the words कृत्रिमाकृत्रिमयोरिति॥ न्यायोऽयम्। तथा हि। सर्वार्थाभिधानशक्तियुक्तः शब्दो यदा विशिष्टेऽर्थे संव्यवहाराय नियम्यते तदा तत्रैव प्रतीतिं जनयति नान्यत्र॥

1. This is directed against Kaiyaṭa and others.

2. Cf. Paribhâshâ C.

3. P: सामान्येति। शब्दत्वादिनेत्यर्थः॥

description does not tend to assist our understanding.[1] This has been considered elsewhere.[2]

---

1. And it connot be said that our views are opposed to those expressed in the words of Hari:

व्यवहाराय नियमः संज्ञायाः संज्ञिनि क्वचित्

'Certain terms are for the sake of verbal intercourse (by mutual agreement) restricted so as to (denote only) some of the objects (which they might denote according to their etymology etc.);' for if one has agreed about the meaning of a word then by the force of this agreement that meaning only is conveyed by the word, and no other meaning. Similar is the relation between words qualifying and qualified; the meaning of the one limits the meaning of the other.

2. Viz. in the Manjûshâ.

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ X.

The (roots) इङ् and शीङ् have the Anubandha ङ्; one might therefore suppose that (the substitution of) Guṇa (for the radical vowel which is taught in P. VII., 3, 84) ought (*e. g.* in the formation of the Periph. Fut.) अध्येता, शयिता[1] etc. to be forbidden (by P. I., 1, 5 क्ङिति च[2]). To reject this supposition (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

---

1. शयित इति । निष्ठा शीङ् [१. २. १९] इति कित्त्वनिषेधः । आदिना शयितेत्यादिसंग्रहः । शयितेति तृजन्तपाठस्तु सुगम एव ॥ P.

2. क्ङितीति सत्सप्तमीति भावः P. The doubt whether in the formation of अध्येता etc. Guṇa be forbidden by P. I., 1, 5, arises when क्ङिति in P. I., 1, 5 is explained by क्ङिति सति 'when there is anything which has the Anubandha क् or ङ्,' but not when it is taken in the sense of as क्ङिति परतः 'when something follows that has the Anubandha क or ङ्.' Bhairava says: क्ङितीति सूत्रार्थप्रविष्टं निमित्तपदं कारणमात्रपरमित्यभिप्रायेण शङ्का;

**P. X: Surely, that which undergoes an operation can, so far as it undergoes that operation, not be made the cause (of the application of a grammatical rule).**

The circumstance that (the word शयितृ in which Guṇa has actually been substituted for the radical vowel of शी) has been put down (by Pâṇini) in P. IV., 2, 15, indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ, the existence of which is) also[1] (proved

---

if the word निमित्त which enters into the explanation of P. I., 1, 5 (क्ङिन्निमित्ते ये गुणवृद्धी etc.) be taken in the general sense of 'cause,' this term may be applied also to the radical vowel इ in the formation of अध्येता; इ, for which Guṇa is substituted, is one of the causes of this Guṇa; but इ is at the same time ङित्, and one might therefore suppose that the substitution of Guṇa, the cause इ of which has the Anubandha ङ्, would be forbidden by P. I., 1, 5.

1. According to Sîradeva and others the existence of this Paribhâshâ is indicated by the prohibition of the substitution of Guṇa in दीधीङ् and वेवीङ् in P. I., 1, 6, or by the fact that the root कुङ् is read in the Gaṇa कुटादि of P. I., 2, 1. But this is incorrect; for the rule I., 1, 6 is either altogether rejected, or if it be retained, its purpose is said to be the prevention of the *aniglakshaṇâ Vṛiddhi* in the formation of आदीध्यक etc. which would result from P. VII., 2, 115; in neither case can I., 1, 6 be a Jnâpaka of this Paribhâshâ. Nor is the circumstance of कुङ being read amongst the कुटादि of P. I., 2, 1 a Jnâpaka, for, as कुङ must be read somewhere, it may as well be read there as anywhere else.—The word च after निर्देशः includes the circumstance that after शीङ् the affixes denoted by निष्ठा (when preceded by इट्) are by P. I., 2, 19 forbidden to be कित्, (in other words are not to prevent the substitution of Guṇa for the ई of शीङ्); this prohibition would be useless if the ङ् of शीङ did by P. I., 1, 5 prevent the substitution of Guṇa for the radi-

otherwise). The words 'so far as it undergoes that operation' are intended to make (the formation of) ऊर्णुनविषति and other (forms) possible. For in (the formation of) this (ऊर्णुनविषति) the syllable नु has been reduplicated in accordance with P. I., 1, 59, whereas without (the restriction 'so far as it undergoes that operation') that (rule of Pâṇini's) could have had no concern (with the formation of ऊर्णुनविषति). The term सन्यङोः in P. VI., 1, 9 being a Genitive, that which ends with सन् (*i. e.* ऊर्णु+इस्) undergoes the operation (of reduplication taught in P. VI., 1, 9. Were, then, the present Paribhâshâ to enjoin merely that 'that which undergoes an operation cannot be made the cause of the application of a grammatical rule') इस् (which forms part of the *kâryin* ऊर्णु+इस्) could not be the cause of the (peculiar) reduplication (which is taught in P. I., 1, 59. But as the Paribhâshâ teaches that that which undergoes an operation can only so far as it undergoes that operation not become the cause of the application of a grammatical rule, there is no reason why इस् in ऊर्णु + इस् should not cause the application of P. I., 1. 59; for although ऊर्णु + इस्, which includes इस्, is *kâryî*, yet the syllable नु only can be called the *kâryam anubhavan kâryî*). In reality[1]

cal ई. And च includes further also the circumstance that the Bhâshya does not reject दीधी and वेवी in P. I., 1, 6 by simply stating that these roots are ङित् and that they therefore fall under P. I., 1, 5 and need not be specially mentioned in I., 1, 6. If the present Paribhâshâ did not exist, this would have been the simplest course for the author of the Bhâshya to adopt.—Besides अध्येता and शयिता Pâyaguṇḍa gives the example अरिरिषति; see Si. Kau. II., p. 203 and Nâgojîbhaṭṭa on P. I., 1, 59. (Ed. Ballantyne pag. 684.)

1. वस्तुतः must be taken together with तत्त्वम; what is included by these two words contains the Siddhânta.

the truth is as follows: the difference between material and instrumental cause being established in the whole world and in all branches of science,[1] the material cause is never made the instrumental cause,[2] and therefore this (Paribhâshâ) need not be established by means of a Jnâpaka. On this account the word हि 'surely' is employed (in the Paribhâshâ); for this (हि) shows that the reason[3] why (that which undergoes an operation) is not made the cause (of the application of a grammatical rule) is well known. (The existence of) this (Paribhâshâ) is suggested by the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 59.[4]

---

1. As *e. g.* in the Nyâya-philosophy etc.

2. तस्य तत्त्वेन, *i. e.* समवायिकारणस्य निमित्तकारणत्वेन. P.

3. हेतोः, *i. e.* सकललोकतन्त्रप्रसिद्धभेदवत्त्वस्य. P.

4. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 59 (Edit. pag. 684.): अज्ग्रहणं तु ज्ञापकं रूपस्थानिवद्भावस्य । यदयमज्ग्रहणं करोति तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यो रूपं स्थानिवद्भवतीति । कथं कृत्वा ज्ञापकम् । अज्ग्रहणस्यैतत्प्रयोजनम् । इह मा भूत् । जेघ्रीयते देध्मीयते । यदि च रूपं स्थानिवद्भवतीति ततोऽज्ग्रहणमर्थवद्भवति । अथ हि कार्यं नार्थोऽज्ग्रहणेन भवत्येवात्र द्विर्वचनम् ॥ The term अचि in P. I., 1, 59 indicates that by this rule the substitute has to be considered *formally* the same as the original, (not, that it is to undergo the same operation which the original would have had to undergo). For the term अचि has been employed to show that P. I., 1, 59 has no concern with the formation of जेघ्रीयते, देध्मीयते. *This* अचि can show only when by P. I., 1, 59 the substitute has to be considered formally the same as the original, not when by that rule the substitute has to undergo the same operation which the original would have had to undergo. For in देध्मीयते etc. the substitute ध्मी has actually undergone the same operation of reduplication which the original ध्मा would have had to undergo; (but ध्मी has not been considered formally the same as the original ध्मा, else the Frequentative would have been दाध्मीयते).

This passage of the Bhâshya suggests according to Bhairavamis'ra the present Paribhâshâ including the restriction कार्यमनुभवन्, viz. thus: Ac-

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XI.

The technical term घु is (in P. I., 1, 20) assigned to (the root दा in) this particular form दा. One might therefore say that it cannot apply to दाप्[1] (which by P. VII., 3, 36 is formed from दा by the addition of the augment प्, and that consequently the rule P. VIII., 4, 17 according to which the न् of the preposition नि is under certain circumstances changed to ण् when नि is prefixed to the roots termed घु, cannot take effect when नि is prefixed to the Causal दापि of दा, *e. g.*) in (the formation of) प्रणिदापयति etc. To meet this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says :

**P. XI: That to which an augment is added denotes, because the augment forms part of it, (not merely itself, but it denotes also) whatever results from its combination with that augment.**

---

cording to the Bhâshya the term अचि in P. I., 1, 59 is to prevent the application of that rule to जेघ्नीयते etc. But if the Paribh. X. does not contain the restriction कार्यमनुभवन्, Pânini's rule can, also without its containing the term अचि, have no concern with जेघ्नीयते etc., in the same manner in which the same rule would have no concern with the formation of ऊर्णुनविषति, if the Paribhâshâ did not contain the words कार्यमनुभवन्. The circumstance therefore that Patanjali assigns to अचि in P. I., 1, 59 the function that it is to prevent the application of P. I., 1, 59 to जेघ्नीयते etc., shows that the Paribhâshâ does contain the restriction कार्यमनुभवन्. (कार्यमनुभवन्नित्यंशोऽपि तस्माद्भाष्यादेव लभ्यते । अन्यथा यङन्तस्य कार्यित्वेन द्विर्वचनेऽचीत्यस्य प्रवृत्तिर्न स्यात् ॥ Bhairava).

1. *Viz.* because दाप formally differs from दा, and because the part दा of दाप् has no meaning and can therefore according to Paribh. XIV. not be denoted by the दा in P. I., 1, 20.

*I. e.* the augment which is assigned to anything[1] must according to the rules of grammar[2] be regarded as part of the latter, and is therefore (together with that to which it is added[3]) denoted by the word which denotes that (to which the augment is assigned.) The portion (of the Paribhâshâ) 'because the augment forms part of it' contains the reason why this is the case[4]. We observe also in the common practice of life that whenever a person Devadatta possesses any limb in excess (of those limbs which men ordinarily are possessed of), the word 'Devadatta' denotes (the man Devadatta as) possessed of that (additional limb and does not denote Devadatta without it). In consequence of our having said above 'the augment which is assigned to anything' दार् (in दारयति etc.) is not termed घु (and P. VIII., 4, 17 does therefore not take effect) in (the formation of) प्रनिदारयति etc.[5] Owing to the fact that P. VII., 2, 82

---

1. यमुद्दिश्य; यम् is explained by एतत्परिभाषाप्रवृत्तिविषयसूत्रे कार्यित्वेन निर्दिष्टम् 'that which in a rule where this Paribhâshâ applies, is put down as undergoing the operation (of having an augment added to it),' as *e.g.* an Anga ending in आ, like दा, in P. VII., 3, 36. That to which the augment is added may in the rule which enjoins the addition of the augment be given anyhow, (*e. g.* दा is described in VII., 3, 36 as 'an Anga ending in आ'); and it need not be given in its own specific form, (otherwise दा ought in VII., 3, 36 to have been put down as दा, or the Paribhâshâ would not have been applicable to it).

2. *Viz.* according to such rules as P. I., 1, 46 आद्यन्तौ टकितौ.

3. बोध्यते, *scil.* समुदायः. P.

4. तत्र *i. e.* तेन तद्बोधने. P. Others explain तत्र by 'in the Paribhâshâ'. If one reads तत्र तद्गुणीभूतः, तत्र refers to the explanation of the Paribhâshâ यमुद्दिश्य etc.

5. The letter र् in दारयति is not an augment assigned to दा, but it is by P. I., 1, 51 assigned to आ. If the explanation of the Paribhâshâ

enjoins the addition of the augment म् (to the final अ of an Anga, *e. g.* in पच+आन=पचमान), this (Paribhâshâ) is not valid always. If it were universally valid, P. VII., 2, 82 would clearly be useless, for subsequently to the addition of म to the (final) अ (of पच etc.) in पच+आन etc. the (homogeneous long) vowel आ would (by P. VI., 1, 101) be substituted for the अम्[1] (of पचम् which by the present Paribhâshâ would be equal to अ, and the आ of आन; we should thus obtain the form पचान which could have been formed also without P. VII., 2, 82). Because (the Paribhâshâ is not always valid), य् etc. are not substituted (for ई etc.) in दिदीये, and (for the same reason) does the rule P. VII., 1, 34 not take effect in (the formation of) जहार etc.[2] It is inadmissible to maintain (in regard to the addition

---

did not contain the words यमुद्दिश्य, र might, as forming part of आ, also be considered to form part of दा, and thus दार् also would be denoted by the दा of P. I., 1, 20.

1. विशिष्टस्य, *i. e.* अमः । अकृत्वेन ग्रहणादाकारेण सहेति शेषः ॥ P.

2. If the Paribhâshâ did apply everywhere, one ought to form: दी+ए; by P. VI., 4, 63 दी+ये; दिदी+ये; by P. VI., 4, 82 दिद्ये. The augment युट् would in that case have been taught in order that one might by P. VIII., 4, 47, Vârtt. obtain optionally three य्'s.—In जहार र् is an augment of आ; if the Paribh. were valid here, P. VII., 1, 34 would have been applicable to जहार्+अ as it is applicable to roots ending in आ, and one ought to have formed जहौ. In the case of प्रनिदार-यति, दार् could not be said to be according to this Paribhâshâ denoted by दा because the augment र् was not added to दा, but to आ. In the case of जहार, the आ of P. VII., 1, 34 would, if the Paribhâshâ were valid, denote also आर्, because the augment र् is added to आ and because the आ of P. VII., 1, 34 means simply आ and does not mean 'a root ending in आ.' The word धातोः is no longer valid in VII., 1, 34, and

of the augment म् to the अ of पच etc.) that one letter cannot form part of another letter अ etc.; for the Paribhâshâ teaches that it *does* form part of it; moreover it ought to be understood that 'being part of anything' means (here) 'being like the part of anything'.[1]

Nor would it be correct to assume that the said (rule P. VII., 2, 82) indicates that the present (Paribhâshâ) does not apply in (any case where an augment is added to) a letter; for such an assumption would be contrary to the following (three) statements which occur in the Bhâshya:

(*a*). In the Bhâshya[2] on P. VII., 2, 82, the (true) meaning of which rule is this, that the augment म् is added to the letter अ which forms part of an Anga etc., the doubt is raised, whether

---

even if it were suggested by णल्, the only two possible constructions would be either धातोः परस्याकारात्परस्य च णलः etc., or धातोरवयवीभूतादाकारात्परस्य णलः etc., for that which is suggested by something else, as धातु would be suggested by णल्, can only modify, but cannot be modified by, something that is actually read in a rule; if धातोः were modified by आतः of P. VII., 1, 34, we should have to construe आकारान्ताद्धातोः परस्य णलः. Nor is the last construction preferable to the preceding one on account of the maxim संभवति सामानाधिकरण्ये वैयधिकरण्यमन्याय्यम्, for we do not accept this maxim. All is perfectly correct without this maxim and without धातोः being supplied. The Genitive अङ्गस्य being still valid in P. VII., 1, 34 we explain this rule, 'after आ, औ takes the place of णल् when णल् is the cause of the term Anga (being applied to that which precedes णल्).'

1. According to the maxim विनापि प्रत्ययं पूर्वोत्तरपदयोर्वा लोपो वाच्यः; cf. Si. Kau. I., pag. 708.

2. Bhâshya on P. VII., 2, 82: आने मुक्। मुकि सति स्वरे दोषो भवति। पचमानो यजमानः। मुका व्यवहितत्वादनुदात्तत्वं न प्राप्नोति। ननु चायं मुगदुपदेशभक्तोऽदुपदेशग्रहणेन ग्रहिष्यते ॥.

the accent enjoined in P. VI., 1, 186 ought to be given to पचमान (considering that the affix आन is separated from पच by the augment म्); and this doubt is met by the statement that that which in grammar is given as ending with अ (as *e. g.* पच) combined with the augment म् (in other words, that the whole पचम्) will be denoted by that which in grammar is given as ending with अ (*i. e.* by अदुपदेश of P. VI., 1, 186) because the augment (म्) forms part of this (अ).

(*b*). One[1] explanation of P. VIII., 3, 32 is this, that the augments ङ्, ण्, न् are prefixed to the letters ङ्, ण्, न्, when they form part of a word ending in ङ्, ण्, न् and are preceded by a short vowel.[2] Now it has been suggested in the Bhâshya[3] on P. VIII., 3, 32 that, when according to this explanation the augment न् has been prefixed to the न् (of

---

1. In the last instance the letter to which the augment is added is a *Vis'eshana i. e.* it modifies something else, for the meaning of अदुपदेश in P. VI., 1, 186 is अकारान्तोपदिश्यमान. N. proceeds now to give an instance in which the letter to which the augment is added is a *Vis'eshya i. e.* is modified by something else; cf. the explanation of P. VIII., 4, 1 र् ष् इत्येताभ्यां परस्य न् इत्येतस्य, and that of P. VIII., 4, 37 पदान्ते वर्तमानस्य न् इत्येतस्य र् ष् इत्येताभ्यां परस्य.

2. This explanation of P. VIII., 3, 32 is, however, incorrect; the real meaning of Pâṇini's rule is this, that a word which begins with a vowel and follows upon the letters ङ्, ण्, न्, which stand at the end of a word and are preceded by a short vowel, has the augment ङ्, ण्, न prefixed to it.

3. Bhâshya on P. VIII., 3, 32: यदि ङम एव ङमुट् क्रियते कुर्वन्नास्ते रषाभ्यां नो णः समानपदे [८. ४. १] इति णत्वं प्राप्नोति। पदान्तस्य [८. ४. ३७] इति प्रतिषेधो भविष्यति। पदान्तस्येत्युच्यते नैष पदान्तः। पदान्तभक्तः पदान्तग्रहणेन ग्राहिष्यते ॥.

कुर्वन् etc.) in कुर्वन्नास्ते etc., this augment न् ought (by P. VIII., 4, 1) to be changed to ण्; but this suggestion is met by the statement that by the present maxim (viz. by our Paribhâshâ) the first न also, (being the augment of a final letter), is called the final (of the word कुर्वन्), and that its change to ण् is therefore forbidden by P. VIII., 4, 37 पदान्तस्य. The meaning[1] of this passage of the Bhâshya is this, that according to the present Paribhâshâ augments also must be regarded as characterised by the same properties as characterise that to which they are added.

(c). Moreover (the author of the Bhâshya) demands that, when र् has been added to a Guṇa-vowel (अ) etc., the Guṇa-vowel (अ) etc. together with र् shall be regarded as Guṇa etc.; otherwise the restriction that only अर् and आर् are Guṇa and Vṛiddhi of the letter ऋ, would not exist. That (demand) however is irreconcilable with the opinion according to which the present (Paribhâshâ) does not apply in any case where an augment is added to a letter. Because then (the terms Guṇa and Vṛiddhi are applicable to अर् and आर्) the (author of the) Bhâshya[2]

1. Now one might say that, although according to Paribhâshâ XI. the final to which the augment is added and the augment, when both have been combined, might be called पदान्त, nevertheless the augment alone ought not be called thus. N. explains therefore the meaning of the Bhâshya in the words अनया परिभाषया etc.; (if one reads अनया च, च has the sense of तु or it stands वाक्यालंकारे). We ought then, in this case, to explain the Paribhâshâ thus: 'whatever properties characterise that to which an augment is assigned, they characterise (not merely the combined whole of the augment and that to which it is added, but) also the augment alone, because the augment forms part of that to which it is added.'

2. भाष्यम, *scil.* संगच्छते. P.

on P. VIII., 2, 42 (states correctly) that, when speaking of Guṇa and Vṛiddhi, we mean that the (letters अ and आ) if they have ॰ (*i.e.* r) on the top of them are (likewise) termed Guṇa and Vṛiddhi (*e. g.* अर् and आर् in कर्तृ and कार्त्ति).

It is only because[1] (the existence of this Paribhâshâ has been established), that rules like P. VII., 2, 4 and VI., 4, 51 etc.[2] have a meaning. (The combination of सिच् with the augment इट् and that of an Ârdhadhâtuka-affix with इट् are by this Paribhâshâ likewise called सिच् and Ârdhadhâtuka. If this were not the case, P. VII., 2, 4 would be superfluous; for the rule VII., 2, 3 which teaches the substitution of Vṛiddhi would not apply in the formation of forms like अदेवीत् because सिच् is separated from the Anga by the augment इट्; and अनिटि in P. VI., 4, 51 would be superfluous, for the elision of णि which is taught in that rule would not affect forms like कारयिता, because the Ârdhadhâtuka-affix is separated from णि by इट्).

The statement,[3] however, that that to which an augment is added combined with that augment is a substitute for the

---

1. Some have maintained that the existence of Paribhâshâ XI. is merely indicated by P. VII., 2, 4 and similar rules; but this is incorrect, for this Paribhâshâ is, as has been stated above in the words 'we observe also in the common practice of life etc.', established by a maxim which is generally accepted. To indicate this our author says 'it is only because....'

2. The इत्यादि includes such Nirdes'as as अक्षराणि etc. in P. I., 1, 34 etc.; although the augment नुम् is here added to अक्षर, the word remains nevertheless अक्षर.

3. Now one might say 'that P. VII., 2, 4 नेटि, and अनिटि in P. VI., 4, 51 would not be superfluous, even if Paribhâshâ XI. did not exist, and that they therefore cannot indicate the existence of this Paribhâshâ;

former without the augment (*e. g.* इट्+an Ârdhadhâtuka affix a substitute for that Ârdhadhâtuka affix) has the following meaning. When we understand the purport of (the rule) that the augment इट् shall be added to an Ârdhadhâtuka affix, we feel at once the impropriety of assigning augments to words eternal (and unchangeable), and we turn the given rule therefore, in order to give a sense to it, so as to make it convey the meaning 'that in place of the notion of (the Ârdhadhâtuka) void of इट् we have to conceive the notion of (the Ârdhadhâtuka) accompanied by इट्.'[1] And thus here also (*i. e.* in the case of augments), as in the case of substitutes, (only) our notions are changed (and not the forms of the words) and the eternity (and unchangeableness of words) remains therefore unimpaired. Further,[2] the substitutes spoken of in the Sthânivatsûtra (P. I.,

---

that they, on the contrary, are meant to prohibit the rule which teaches the substitution of Vriddhi etc. from applying by Sthânivadbhâva in the formation of अदेवीत् etc. in consequence of the maxim अनागमकानां सागमका आदेशाः.' And one might further maintain, 'that Paribhâshâ XI. in so far as it teaches that that to which an augment is attached combined with the augment is equal to the former without the augment, is useless because this follows from Sthânivadbhâva in consequence of the same maxim अनागमकानां सागमका आदेशाः'. To refute these opinions our author says: 'The statement ....'

1. P.: अयमर्थ इत्यस्य कर्तव्येतीत्यत्रान्वयः । यथाश्रुतार्थतात्पर्ये वीजप्रतिपादनपूर्वकमत्र हेतुमाहार्धधातुकेत्यादिकल्पनेनेत्यन्तेन तथा च सा हेतौ तृतीया । °नुपपत्त्येत्यभेदे तृतीया तदभिन्ना यार्थापत्तिस्तन्मूलकेत्यर्थः । उपपत्त्यर्थापत्तीति पाठस्तु सुगमः । यद्वा कल्पनायां तस्या हेतुत्वेनान्वय इति यथाश्रुतं तदपि साधु । अर्थापत्तीति कल्पकप्रमाणोपन्यासः । वाक्यान्तरेति । तद्रहितार्धधातुकबुद्धौ सेडार्धधातुकबुद्धिरित्यादिरूपेत्यादिः ॥

2. To refute the opinion that, notwithstanding all that has been said before, Paribhâshâ XI. is unnecessary, because its functions are performed by the Sthânivatsûtra, he says: 'Further...'

1, 56) are not such, (as it were, constructive) substitutes (as result from the statement that that to which an augment is added, combined with that augment, is a substitute for the former without the augment), because the Sthânivatsûtra has reference (only) to such substitutions as are actually taught in Pâṇini's grammar (*e. g.* in P. II., 4, 42 हनो वध). Moreover if the Sthânivatsûtra had reference to such constructive substitutes as are here spoken of, that which is mentioned in the Bhâshya as an established fact, viz. ' that अट् and आट् (are prefixed to roots) while ऌ remains (*i. e.* before the personal terminations are substituted for ऌ),' would not be the case. (In forming अपिबत् and similar forms, we prefix the augment अ according to the Bhâshya, to पा in पा+ऌ, and obtain thus अपा+ऌ; if by the Sthânivatsûtra अपा were here equal to पा) पिब etc. (taught in P. VII., 3, 78) would have to be substituted (not for पा) but for the whole combination अपा (the result of which would not be अपिबत्, but पिबत्).[1] Paribhâshâ XII. (according to which पिब ought to be substituted only for the पा actually put down in P. VII., 3, 78) would in this case not be applicable, because the operation (of substituting पिब) would be proceeded with solely on the ground that (अपा) is regarded as (equal to पा) for which it has been substituted.—If[2] Paribhâshâ XII. were applicable in cases where a substitute

1. If the Sthânivatsûtra had reference to such constructive substitutes as are here spoken of, the author of the Bhâshya ought to have said that the augments अट् and आट् are prefixed to roots after the personal terminations have been substituted for ऌ, and after the subtitution of पिब etc. for पा etc.

2. One might further maintain that, although अपा is considered equal to पा, nevertheless not this combination अपा is *nirdis'yamâna* in P. VII., 3, 78, but only पा, and that therefore the application of Pari-

(by the Sthânivatsûtra) is like that for which it has been substituted, the following proceeding (of the author) of the Bhâshya would be incorrect. (P. VII., 1, 53 teaches that जय is substituted for क्रि; P. VII., 2, 99, that तिसृ is substituted for त्रि;) in (the formation of) the Gen. Fem., तिसृ (and not जय) is substituted (for त्रि) because (the rule which teaches तिसृ) follows (upon the rule which teaches the substitution of जय; here then the author of the Bhâshya) raises the doubt whether जय (by P. VII., 1, 53) ought to be substituted also for तिसृ (on the ground that the latter) by the Sthânivatsûtra (is like त्रि), and he rejects this doubt by means of Paribhâshâ XL. (according to which a rule that has been superseded once cannot apply again. If Paribhâshâ XII. were applicable in this case, the doubt whether जय ought to be substituted for तिसृ could not have arisen at all, because by this Paribhâshâ जय could have been substituted only for त्रि which is actually put down in P. VII, 1, 53; or if the doubt had arisen, it ought to have been rejected by Paribh. XII. and not by Paribh. XL.)

As[1] (Pâṇini) in rules like III., 4, 86 has put down a Genitive case which conveys the sense that for that which is denot-

---

bhâshâ XII. in the case of अपिबत् is allowable. One might say that the Sthânivatsûtra applies without Par. XII. only in particular cases in which the augments इट् etc. are added, but that elsewhere Par. XII. is applicable together with the Sthânivatsûtra. To refute this our author says: 'If Paribh. XII. ...'

1. According to the preceding the Sthânivatsûtra refers only to *s'rauta âdes'a i. e.* to substitutes actually taught in Pâṇini's grammar, but not to *ânumânika âdes'a i. e.* substitutes which are not actually taught but are substitutes only by inference (in the manner in which *e. g.* the combination of an augment and that to which it is added is considered a

ed by the word in the Genitive case, something else is substituted, we are not wrong in applying the Sthânivatsûtra to (such substitutes as result from) rules like III. 4, 86, even though the meaning of the said rule III., 4. 86 is (not that उ shall be substituted for इ, but) that something ending with उ shall be substituted for something ending with इ, and although the substitute taught in this rule is therefore (not the letter उ actually given in it, but) a combination of letters ending with उ. (We are not, we say, wrong in applying here the Sthânivatsûtra) because the word आदेश 'substitute' (in the Sthânivatsûtra) is employed for the very purpose (that the Sthânivatsûtra may be applied also in cases like this where a rule actually teaches a substitute which for some reason or other has to be transformed; but the Sthânivatsûtra has no reference to such substitutes as result from the statement that that to which an augment is added, combined with that augment, is a substitute for the former without the augment).[1] The relation which obtains between a substitute and that for which it is substituted, such as both are actually enunciated in a

---

substitute for the latter without the augment). This being the case, it may appear doubtful whether the Sthânivatsûtra is applicable to the substitute which we obtain from P. III., 4, 86. Therefore he says: 'As (Pâṇini)...'

1. P.: तदन्तपरतयेति | नित्यत्वानुपपत्तिमूलिकयेत्यादिः | अर्थवत्येव स्थान्यादेशभावविश्रान्तेः शब्दरूपं विशेष्यमादाय वर्णग्रहणे तदन्तग्रहणादिति भावः | °वाक्यस्यैव | एरुरित्यादेरेव | इदं च मध्यमणिन्यायेनान्वेति (viz. with the preceding and following) | एतेनापठितागमस्थलीयानुमानिकवाक्यसदृशवाक्यव्यावृत्तिः | आदेशग्रहणेति | स्थानिवदित्युक्त्यैव संबन्धिशब्दमहिम्नादेशाक्षेपे सिद्धे पुनरादेशग्रहणसामर्थ्यादित्यर्थः | तस्य तादृशसमुदायादेशस्य || तथा च श्रौतस्थान्यादेशभावे तदनुपपत्तिमूलकतया कल्प्यमानतादृशस्थान्यादेशभावे च तत्प्रवृत्तिर्न त्वागमस्थलीये तत्रेति फलितम् ||

rule, remains unimpaired even though one (without paying any regard to the several constituent elements of a form) assumes, that the whole new form which results from the substitution, is a substitute for the whole old form, as it was before the substitution, and rules like P. I., 1, 57 अचः परस्मिन्पूर्वविधौ are therefore not improper.[1]

The opinion that the objects for which Paribhâshâ XI. is given are attained by the Sthânivatsûtra (and that Paribhâshâ XI. is therefore superfluous) is by the above refuted.

All this is found in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 20.

---

1. P. supplies यथा before आनुमानिकस्थान्यादेश°, and the words तथात्वापि श्रौतावयवावयविभावस्य न त्याग इति यदागमा इत्येतत्प्रवृत्तिरव्याहतैवेति प्रणिदापयतीत्यादौ न दोषः after नासंगतिः; just as......P. I., 1, 57 does not become improper, so are also in the case of augments that to which the augment is added and the augment itself considered as separate, consequently Paribhâshâ XI. is applicable and प्रणिदापयति is correctly formed.

---

Extract from the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 20:[1]

समानशब्दप्रतिषेधः । समानशब्दानां प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । प्रनिदारयति प्रनिधारयति । दाधा घुसंज्ञा भवन्तीति घुसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति ॥ समानशब्दाप्रतिषेधोऽर्थवद्ग्रहणात् । समानशब्दानामप्रतिषेधः । अनर्थकः प्रतिषेधो ऽप्रतिषेधः । घुसंज्ञा कस्मान्न भवति । अर्थवद्ग्रहणात् ।

---

1. Kaiyaṭa: समानशब्दानामिति । समानश्रुतीनामित्यर्थः ॥ प्रनिदारयति प्रनिधारयतीति । दृङ्धृङोर्णिचि वृद्धावाकारे दाधाशब्दौ संपद्येते तौ चार्थवन्तौ पश्चात्तु रपरत्वं क्रियमाणमागमभूतत्वादन्यत्वं न करोतीति प्राप्तिः ॥ अर्थवद्ग्रहणादिति । अर्थवद्ग्रहणे नानर्थकस्येत्यस्यार्थस्य स्वं रूपमित्यनेन ज्ञापितत्वात् । उरण् रपर इति चाण्विधीयमान एव रपरो भवतीति वृद्धिः क्रियमाणा रपरा भवतीति दाधोरेवार्थवत्त्वं न तु तदवयवयोरिति

अर्थवतोर्दाधोर्ग्रहणं नैतावर्थवन्तौ ॥ **अनुपसर्गाद्वा** । **अथवा** यत्क्रियायुक्ताः प्रादयस्तं प्रत्येव गत्युपसर्गसंज्ञा भवन्ति न चैतौ दाधौ प्रति क्रियायोगः । यद्येवमिहापि **तर्हि** न प्राप्नोति प्रणिदापयति प्रणिधापयतीति । अत्रापि नैतौ दाधावर्थवन्तौ नाप्येतौ दाधौ प्रति क्रियायोगः ॥ **न वा । अर्थवतो ह्यागमस्तद्गुणीभूतस्तद्ग्रहणेन गृह्यते** यथान्यत्र । न वैष दोषः । किं कारणम् । अर्थवत आगमस्तद्गुणीभूतो ऽर्थवद्ग्रहणेन गृह्यते यथान्यत्र । तद्यथान्यत्राप्यर्थवत आगमो ऽर्थवद्ग्रहणेन गृह्यते । क्वान्यत्र । लविता चिकीर्षितेति । **युक्तं** पुनर्यन्नित्येषु नाम शब्देष्वागमशासनं स्यान्न नित्येषु नाम शब्देषु कूटस्थैरविचालिभिर्वर्णैर्भवितव्यमनपायोपजनविकारिभिः । आगमश्च नामापूर्वः शब्दोपजनः । **अथ** युक्तं यन्नित्येषु शब्देष्वादेशाः स्युः । **बाढं** युक्तम् । शब्दान्तरैरिह भ-

---

नास्ति घुसंज्ञा ॥ अनुपसर्गाद्वा । अभ्युपगम्य घुसंज्ञां दोषं परिहरति । घुसंज्ञापेक्षया यस्योपसर्गत्वं तस्मात्परस्य नेर्घो परतो णत्वं विधीयते । अत्र दाधापेक्षया नास्ति प्रशब्दस्योपसर्गत्वं किंतु दाप्धाप्शब्दापेक्षयेत्यदोषः ॥ इहापि तर्हीति । अत्रापि पुकि कृते पकारान्तोऽर्थवान्न केवलो दाशब्दः पुगन्तमेव च प्रत्युपसर्गत्वं न दाशब्दं प्रतीति प्रश्नः ॥ न वार्थवत इति । लब्धात्मकस्य भावस्य निमित्तवशादुपचयापचयौ व्यपदेशहानिं न कुरुतो यथा देवदत्तस्याङ्गाधिक्याङ्गच्छेदौ । इहाप्यन्तरङ्गत्वात्कृतायां दाधोर्घुसंज्ञायां पश्चादुत्पन्नः पुगागमो व्यपदेशं न निवर्तयति नाप्यर्थवत्त्वमित्यदोषः । अनर्थकस्याप्यागमो व्यपदेशहानिं न करोति यथा सत्यपि रेफ आकाराकारयोर्वृद्धिगुणव्यपदेशाहानिः । इह त्वर्थवतोर्ग्रहणादर्थवत इत्युक्तम् । यदा च प्रकृत्यर्थः प्रेण विशेष्यते तदायं परिहारः । ण्यर्थविशेषणत्वे तु प्रस्य दाधौ प्रत्यनुपसर्गत्वाण्णत्वं न भवत्येव ॥ तद्गुणीभूत इति । प्रयोगसंपादन उपकारक इत्यर्थः ॥ युक्तं पुनरिति । ततश्च नित्येष्वागमविरोधात्तद्द्वारेणादेशविधानादाप्शब्द एवार्थवान्न दाशब्द इति तदवस्थो दोष इति भावः ॥ अथ युक्तमिति । तत्रापि स्थानिनमपनीयादेशः क्रियत इत्यनित्यत्वप्रसङ्गः । यश्चोभयोर्दोषो न तमेकश्चोद्यः ॥ बाढमिति । प्रसङ्गवाची स्थानशब्दो न निवृत्तिवाची । ततश्च सन्त एव प्रयोगे नित्याः शब्दा बुडुगुन्मज्जननिमज्जनद्वारे-

वितव्यम् । तत्र शब्दान्तराच्छब्दान्तरस्य प्रतिपत्तिर्युक्ता । आदेशास्त-र्हीमे भविष्यन्ति । अनागमकानां सागमकाः । तत्कथम् ।

सर्वे सर्वपदादेशा दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिनेः ।

एकदेशविकारे हि नित्यत्वं नोपपद्यते ॥

---

ण प्रतिपाद्यन्ते । आगमस्त्ववस्थितस्यापूर्वः क्रियमाणो नित्यत्वं विरुणद्धि ॥ आदेशास्तर्हीति । इड् भवतीत्यनेन द्वारेण तव्यस्येतव्यादेशः क्रियते ॥ सर्वे इति । आगमा अपीत्यर्थः ॥ सर्वपदादेशा इति । पदशब्देन न सुप्तिङन्तं गृह्यतेऽपि तु कार्यं प्रति यत्पद्यमानं प्रतीयमानं प्रकृतिप्रत्ययादि तत्सर्वम् ॥ एकदेशविकारे हीति । यद्यपि सर्वविकारेऽप्यनित्यत्वं यथा पिठरस्थपयसः पाकादिषु तथापि विकाराभावप्रतिपादनार्थमेतत् । बुद्धिविपरिणाममात्रं स्थान्यादेशागमागमिभावद्वारेण क्रियत इत्यर्थः । यद्येवं दाशब्दस्य दाप्शब्द आदेशः क्रियत इति दाशब्दस्यानर्थक्यप्रसङ्गः । नैष दोषः । नित्यतासमर्थनायादेशपक्ष आश्रितः प्रक्रियायां तु कल्पितायामागमागमिभाव एव । अन्यथागमादेशयोर्भेदेन व्यवहारो न स्यात् ॥

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XII.

(By the preceding Paribhâshâ स्था denotes not merely स्था, but it denotes also अस्था, *i. e.* स्था combined with the augment अ). Accordingly one might say that *e. g.* in (the formation of) the Aor. Par. of उद्–स्था (*i. e.* उद्+अस्थात्) a letter homogeneous to the preceding (द् of उद्) ought by P. VIII., 4, 61 to be substituted (for the initial अ of अस्थात्.) To prevent this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

**P. XII: Substitutes take the place of that (or of part of that) which (in a rule) is actually enunciated.[1]**

---

1. Accordingly a letter homogeneous to the द् of उद् is substituted only for the स् of स्था which actually is enunciated in P. VIII., 4, 61, but not for the अ of अस्था although by Par. XI. the latter is likewise denoted by स्था.

(This Paribhâshâ is proved thus :) The rule P. I., 1, 49 is read twice ;[1] when this is done, the second (षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा) conveys the following meaning: 'only that which is enunciated (in a rule), *i. e.* that which is read (in a rule, or rather) that which (in the real language) is like that which is read (in a rule) in a Genitive case,[2] or that which forms part of that which is enunciated (in a Genitive case,[3]) assumes the peculiar relation denoted by the word स्थान 'place' (*i. e.* is that in the place of which something else is substituted), but something suggested[4] by the former (does) not (assume that relation).' Hereby (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ XII.) is established.

And one cannot object that in the case of such rules as P. VII.,

---

1. P.: Although P. I., 1, 49 in the sense (अनिर्धारितसंबन्धविशेषा षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा बोध्या) usually assigned to it is unnecessary, because in every instance where this rule is supposed to apply the *Sthânasambandha i. e.* the import of the Genitive case that something else shall take the place of that which is expressed by the word in the Genitive case, is obtained from *Antarangatva* etc., and though the rule P. I., 1, 49, in order not to be superfluous, must therefore convey the same meaning as the present Paribhâshâ, nevertheless one might consider P. I., 1, 49 even in its usual meaning useful, viz. as instructing those who are ignorant (of *Antarangatva* etc.) and our author assumes therefore that P. I., 1, 49 is read twice.

2. षष्ठी by Paribhâshâ XXIII. means षष्ठ्यन्तम् 'that which ends with the affix of the Genitive case'.

3. निर्दिश्यमानावयवरूपमेव वा; *i. e.* उच्चार्यमाणसजातीयावयवरूपमेव वा; this refers to अतिस्यः etc.; see below.

4. *I. e.* that which either by Paribhâshâ XI. or by the *Tadantavidhi* (P. I., 1, 72) is likewise denoted by that which is enunciated in a rule; *e. g.* स्था would by Par. XI. denote also अस्था, and त्यद् by P. I., 1, 72 also अतित्यद् etc.

4, 32 etc.[1] the substitutes (which are taught in them) would (if this Paribhâshâ really did exist) not take the place of the long vowels (आ etc.) because the latter are not enunciated (in P. VII., 4, 32 etc.); for as (the अ etc. in P. VII., 4, 32 etc. is intended to denote not merely short अ etc., but) generally any अ etc. (and therefore also long आ etc., the substitutes taught in P. VII., 4, 32 etc. take the place also of the long vowels आ etc. and) there arises consequently no fault (from the application of this Paribhâshâ). Moreover[2] there arises no fault because we learn from the prohibition P. VI., 4, 85 that an operation which concerns a letter that is enunciated (in a rule), concerns all letters which that particular letter denotes according to P. I., 1, 69.[3] (It might appear as if this Paribhâshâ made the Anubandha ङ् of इयङ् and उवङ् in P. VI., 4, 77 superfluous; for, as इ and उ are enunciated in the term य्वोः of that rule, one might say that इय् and उव् in accordance with the present Paribhâshâ could have been substituted only for the single letters इ and उ, even if the Anubandha ङ् had not been attached to इय् and उव्); but (this is untenable). As (P. VI.,

1. इत्यादौ; *i. e.* इत्यादिविषये माळीभवतीत्यादौ. P.

2. Now one might say, that although the opinion expressed in the words अस्य च्वौ—निर्दिश्यमानत्वाभावात् has been shown to be untenable, when the vowels अ etc. denote any अ (*jâtipakshe*), it has not been refuted *vyaktipakshe*, *i. e.* on the alternative that अ etc. denote only short अ etc.; therefore our author says: किंच 'moreover,' *scil.* यतः. P.

3. If the substitution of यण् which is taught in P. VI., 4, 82 and 83 did not concern also ई and ऊ etc., भू and सुधी would not fall under those rules, and the prohibition न भूसुधियोः would be meaningless.—The rules P. VI., 4, 82 and 83 would have a meaning even if they referred only to short इ and short उ; for rule 82 would apply *e. g.* in चिच्यतुः and 83 in पट्वौ, the Dual of पटु, in the sense of पटुमन्तमाचष्टे, formed with णिच्, मतुब्लोप, and क्विप्.

4, 77) conveys the meaning 'for roots ending in the letter इ or उ,[1] for श्नु, and for भ्रू etc.' roots etc. are likewise enunciated (in it) and the Anubandha ङ् has therefore been attached to इय् and उव् in order that the latter may be substituted (only) for the final letters (of those roots etc.). But in रीङ् and रिङ् (of P. VII., 4, 27 and 28) ङ् has been attached (to री and रि) solely for the sake of clearness (and has no other functions whatever).[2] The opinion according to which this addition of the Anubandha ङ् (in रीङ् and रिङ्) indicates that the present Paribhâshâ does not apply where a letter is enunciated in a rule (as that for which something else shall be substituted) is refuted by the following,[3] viz. by the circumstance that it is contrary to the Bhâshya on the fifth S'ivasûtra. (There namely it has first been suggested that) the Visarjanîya, Jihvâmûlîya, Upadhmânîya, Anusvâra, Anunâsika,

---

1. On the one hand 'roots,' श्नु, and भ्रू have been enunciated in P. VI., 4, 77; on the other hand, इ and उ; but as the former are of greater importance and as इ and उ only qualify the 'roots', the substitutes इय् and उव् would, if the Anubandha ङ् had not been attached to them, take the place of the whole roots, and of the whole श्नु and भ्रू.

2. The Anubandha ङ् in रीङ् and रिङ् of P. VII., 4, 27 and 28 is superfluous because only the letter ऋ is in these rules enunciated as that for which something else shall be substituted; the word अङ्गस्य which is Adhikâra is not independently but only by the Tadantavidhi (P. I., 1, 72) Sthânin, (the sense being ऋकारान्तस्याङ्गस्य ), and according to the present Paribhâshâ a substitute does not take the place of that which is suggested by the Tadantavidhi. On the other hand, we shall see below in the case of अतिस्य: etc., that a word which is valid by Anuvṛitti has to be considered as enunciated in a rule if the Tadantavidhi is not concerned with it.

3. एतेन, *i. e.* वक्ष्यमाणदोषेण. P.

and Yama should be given (in the S'ivasûtras, and) one of the reasons why (this should be done, has been stated to be this, that, if Visarjanîya etc. were given in the S'ivasûtras, they would be included in the Pratyâhâra अळ् and that, such being the case,) the rule P. I., 1, 52 (would apply in P. VIII., 3, 34 the result of which would be the formation of *e. g.*) वृक्षस्त्व. (If Visarjanîya were not read in the S'ivasûtras it would not be termed अळ्, and the substitute स् which is taught in P. VIII., 3, 34 would not by P. I., 1, 52 be substituted for the final of वृक्षः). But this reasoning has (subsequently) been invalidated in the Bhâshya where it is stated that (the substitution of स् for the Visarjanîya) results already from the present Paribhâshâ (viz. because the Visarjanîya is enunciated in P. VIII., 3, 34. This present Paribhâshâ has therefore in the Bhâshya distinctly been applied in a case where a letter is in a rule enunciated as that for which something else shall be substituted).

This Paribhâshâ teaches that (a substitute) does not take the place of that (or of part of that) which ends with what (in a rule) is enunciated, although (that which is enunciated in a rule) denotes in accordance with the teaching of P. I., 1, 72 also that which ends with it; nor of that combination of what is enunciated (in a rule) with an augment, which according to Paribhâshâ XI. would likewise be denoted by that which is enunciated (in a rule).[1] Therefore सुपदः,[2] उदस्थात् etc. are formed (agreeably to this Paribhâshâ).

1. P.: लब्धस्य *i. e.* विशिष्टस्य तस्याभावबोधनम् (*i. e.* आगमविशिष्टस्य स्थानित्वाभावबोधनम्). This implies that in some cases that Sthânin also which is obtained from the Alo'ntyaparibhâshâ (P. I., 1, 52) likewise loses its Sthânitva by the present Paribhâshâ *i. e.* that sometimes the present Paribhâshâ supersedes P. I., 1, 52. See below.

2. पद् is substituted only for पाद् which is enunciated in P. VI., 4,

Whenever the several conditions under which the rules P. I., 1, 52 etc. apply to a rule that teaches a substitution are fulfilled, then those rules P. I., 1, 52 etc. apply *together with* this Paribhâshâ;[1] they neither supersede it nor are they superseded by it because they do not come into conflict (with this Paribhâshâ). Nor do those rules and this Paribhâshâ stand towards each other in the relation of subserviency, this being improper[2] because both are given for the sake of other (rules). And[3] the word सर्व 'all' in P. I., 1, 55 can only be understood to mean 'all that for which according to this Paribhâshâ something else ought to be

---

130, but not for that which ends with पाद् *i. e.* not for the whole सुपाद्. The आदि after उदस्यादिति suggests त्रिंशक: as an example in the formation of which the Alo'ntyavidhi is superseded by the present Paribhâshâ. See below.

1. *E. g.* in P. VII., 2, 102, त्यदादीनामः; VI., 4, 82 एरनेकाचोऽसंयोगपूर्वस्य etc. The आदि in त्यादीनाम् includes P. I., 1, 54 आदेः परस्य; the Plural I., 1, 55 अनेकाल् शित्सर्वस्य. P. The present Paribhâshâ restricts the substitution to that which is either actually read in a rule or is valid from another rule; the other Paribhâshâs determine which part of that to which the substitution is thus restricted, is to undergo it.—If there were any conflict between the present Paribhâshâ and P. I., 1, 52 etc. the latter would supersede the former, because they follow it in Pâṇini's grammar, for the present Paribhâshâ stands at P. I., 1, 49.

2. According to the maxim गुणानां च परार्थत्वादसंबन्धः समत्वात्.

3. Now one might think that the word सर्व in P. I., 1, 55 denotes the Sthânin obtained from the Tadantavidhi and the Yadâgamaparibhâshâ, that therefore the present Paribhâshâ comes into conflict with, and is superseded by P. I., 1, 55, and that consequently in the formation of सुपदः, and निर्जरसौ etc. पद् and जरस् etc. ought to have been substituted for the whole सुपाद् and निर्जरा etc. To refute this view N. says 'and the word........'

substituted.'[1] It is wrong to say that the two rules P. I., 1, 54 and 52 supersede this Paribhâshâ;[2] for in the Bhâshya on P. VI., 4, 130 the present Paribhâshâ has been made use of within the sphere of the rule (P. I., 1, 54) for (the formation of) उदस्थात्.[3] Nor does this (Paribhâshâ)[4] supersede those two (rules P. I., 1, 54 and 52); for, if this were the case, those two (rules) would, as Kaiyaṭa on P. VI., 4, 142 observes, not be applicable anywhere.[5]

1. But not 'all that which is obtained from the Tadantavidhi and Yadâgamaparibhâshâ.'

2. Because they in Pâṇini's grammar follow upon this Paribhâshâ which stands at P. I., 1, 49.

3. This implies that this Paribhâshâ has in the same place and in the Bhâshya on P. VI., 4, 142 been made use of also within the sphere of P. I., 1, 52.—Moreover as the simultaneous application of this Paribhâshâ and the rules P. I., 1, 54 and 52 has above been shown to be possible, it is according to the maxim अबाधेनैवोपपत्तौ बाधेनोपपत्तिरन्याय्या wrong, to make the latter supersede the former or *vice versâ*. P.

4. Viz. because it is *antaranga*, Sthânasambandha being *antaranga*.

5. Bhâshya on P. VI., 4, 142: ति विंशतेर्डिति ॥ तिग्रहणं किमर्थं न विंशतेर्डिति लोप इत्येवोच्येत । नैवं शक्यम् । विंशतेर्डिति लोप इतीयत्युच्यमानेऽन्त्यस्य प्रसज्येत । सिद्धोऽन्त्यस्य यस्येति लोपेनैव । तत्रारम्भसामर्थ्यात्तिशब्दस्य भविष्यति ॥ कुतो नु खल्वेतत् । अनन्त्यार्थ आरम्भे तिशब्दस्य भविष्यति न पुनरङ्गस्येति । तस्मात्तिग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । अथ क्रियमाणेऽपि तिग्रहणेऽन्त्यस्य कस्मान्न भवति । निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशा भवन्तीति न भविष्यति ॥

Kaiyaṭa: कुतो नु खल्विति ॥ वचनसामर्थ्यादलोऽन्त्यपरिभाषाया अनुपस्थानात्समुदायस्यैव षष्ठीनिर्देशाल्लोपः प्रसज्येत न त्वसंशब्दितस्य तिशब्दस्य । तिग्रहणे तु सति तेर्लोपो भवति ॥ निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशा भवन्तीति । नानेन परिभाषाव्यापारः कथ्यते न हि निर्दिश्यमानपरिभाषालोऽन्त्यस्यादेः परस्येत्येतयोर्बाधिकैतयोर्निर्विषयत्वप्रसङ्गात् । तस्मात्तिग्रहणसामर्थ्यादलोऽन्त्यस्येत्यस्यानुपस्थाने सर्वस्य तेर्लोपो भवतीत्ययमस्य भाष्यस्यार्थः ॥

The maxim propounded in this Paribhâshâ does not refer to cases in which अकच् (by P. V., 3, 71 and 72) is inserted (in a word), because, just as (in a case where there is Sthânivadbhâva a substitution takes place after that for which it is to take place has been suggested solely) by the Sthânivadbhâva,[1] so in the present case also the operation (of substituting something) takes place after that, the place of which the substitute is to take, has been suggested solely by Paribhâshâ LXXXIX.; (*i. e.* the substitute takes the place not merely of that or of part of that which is enunciated in a rule, but also of whatever results from the combination of the latter with अकच्, because according to Paribhâshâ LXXXIX. any word denotes also the same word after अकच् has been inserted in it, together with अकच्.)[2]

---

Pâyagunda says that Nâgojîbhaṭṭa by the word कैयटः wishes to show that he himself disagrees with that scholar. P. discusses the Bhâshya on P. VI., 4, 142 at some length; he maintains that Kaiyaṭa's explanation is not in accordance with the words of the Bhâshya. According to some this Bhâshya does not belong to the Siddhântin, but to an Ekades'in *i. e.* a scholar who is only partly possessed of the truth. Others say that Kaiyaṭa gives the view of the Siddhântin, and that Nâgojîbhaṭṭa in order to show this has quoted P. VI., 4, 142, whereas otherwise he might have quoted P. I., 1, 49.—In reality however it is according to P. the opinion of the Bhâshyakâra that in *some* instances Paribhâshâ XII. does supersede the Alo'ntyaparibhâshâ.

1. See Par. XI.

2. Râghavendrâchârya makes the following remarks: Paribh. XII. does not apply in a rule that teaches a substitution by which अकच् does not disappear, even when Paribh. LXXXIX. is applied. This is proved by the prohibition अकः in P. VII., 2, 112 अनाप्यकः, where अकः would be superfluous if Paribhâshâ XII. did apply. We consequently form by

It ought to be understood that this (Paribhâshâ)[1] applies also where (a substitute takes the place of part of something that is enunciated in a rule and where the latter therefore stands) in the partitive Genitive. On this account the substitute स् which is taught in P. VII., 2, 106 takes in (the formation of) अतिस्यः (from अतित्यद् the place of the त् of त्यद् only which is enunciated in P. VII. 2, 102 but it) does not take the place of the letter त्[2] of the preposition (अति, although त्यद् by P. I., 1, 72 denotes also अतित्यद्. For the same reason) the substitutes यूय etc. (taught in P. VII., 2, 93 etc.) take the place only of the part ending with म् of युष्मद् etc. enunciated (in P. VII., 2, 86) but they do not in (the formation of) अतियूयम् etc. (from अतियुष्मद् etc.) take the place of the part ending with म् (of अतियुष्मद् etc. *i. e.*) of युष्मद् etc. combined with the preposition (अति).

---

P. VII., 2, 86 युवकाभ्याम् from युष्मकद् just as we form युवाभ्याम् from युष्मद्. But the Nirdis'yamânaparibhâshâ does apply in a rule that teaches a substitution by which अकच् would disappear if Paribh. LXXXIX. were applied; *e. g.* in P. VI., 4, 101, where धि is substituted only for हि but not for हकि. अकच् remains therefore in both cases. In P. VII., 2, 103 क is substituted also for किम् with अकच्, because the letter क् is repeated in the substitute; if क were substituted for only किम् Pâṇini would have said that अ is substituted for the इम् of किम्. (अकज्विषय इति । साकच्कानपहारकादेशविधावित्यर्थः । अत्र मानमन्त्राप्यक इत्यत्राक इति प्रतिषेधः । फलं तु युवकाभ्यामित्यादावात्वासिद्धिः । तदपहारके तूपतिष्ठत एवायं न्यायः । यथा हुझल्भ्य इति सूत्रे भाष्ये भिन्द्धकीत्यादावकचि हित्वाभावान्न धित्वमित्याशङ्कितम् । कादेशस्यावृत्त्या पुनर्विधानसामर्थ्यात्साकच्कस्यापि प्रवर्तते ॥)

1. इयं च; चो वाक्यालंकारे. P.

2. Otherwise स् would be substituted also for this त् for the meaning of P. VII., 2, 106 is 'for त् and द् of Angas ending with त्यद् etc.'

This (Paribhâshâ) is found in the Bhâshya[1] on P. VI., 4, 130 and in that on P. I., 1, 49.[2]

---

1. Extract from the Bhâshya on P. VI., 4, 130:

पादः पत् ॥ पाद उपधाह्रस्वत्वम् । पाद उपधाह्रस्वत्वं वक्तव्यम् । द्विपदः पश्य । आदेशे हि सर्वादेशप्रसङ्गः । आदेशे हि सति सर्वादेशः प्रसज्येत । सर्वस्य द्विपाच्छब्दस्य त्रिपाच्छब्दस्य पच्छब्द आदेशः प्रसज्येत येन विधिस्तदन्तस्येति ॥ तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वा निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशत्वात् । न वा वक्तव्यम् । किं कारणम् । निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशा भवन्तीत्येषा परिभाषा कर्तव्या । कः पुनरत्र विशेषः । एषा वा परिभाषा क्रियत उपधाह्रस्वत्वं वोच्यते । अवश्यमेषा परिभाषा कर्तव्या बहून्येतस्याः परिभाषायाः प्रयोजनानि ॥ ........................ उदः स्थास्तम्भोः पूर्वत्वे प्रयोजनम् । उदस्थात उदस्थाताम् । अटि कृते साङ्गस्य पूर्वसवर्णः प्राप्नोति । उदः स्थास्तम्भोरिति । निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशा भवन्तीति न दोषो भवति । यस्तर्हि निर्दिश्यते तस्य कस्मान्न भवति । अटा व्यवहितत्वात् । सा तर्ह्येषा परिभाषा कर्तव्या । न कर्तव्या । उक्तं षष्ठी स्थानेयोगेत्यस्य योगस्य वचने प्रयोजनं षष्ठ्यन्तं स्थानेन यथा युज्येत यतः षष्ठ्युच्चारितेति ॥

2. Extract from the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 49:

न तर्हीदानीमयं योगो वक्तव्यः । वक्तव्यश्च । किं प्रयोजनम् । षष्ठ्यन्तं स्थानेन यथा युज्येत यतः षष्ठ्युच्चारिता । किं कृतं भवति । निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशा भवन्तीत्येषा परिभाषा न कर्तव्या भवतीति ॥

Kaiyaṭa: यतः षष्ठीति ॥ तेन पादः पदित्यस्यायमर्थः । पादन्तस्याङ्गस्यावयवः पाच्छब्दः सूत्रे षष्ठ्या निर्दिष्टस्तस्य पच्छब्द आदेशो भवति न तु प्रतीयमानस्य पादन्तस्य । अस्यैव निर्दिश्यमानस्यादेशा भवन्तीत्ययमर्थः ॥ षष्ठीति षष्ठ्यन्तं गृह्यते । तेन षष्ठ्यन्तमेव निर्दिश्यमानं स्थानेन युज्यते न तु प्रतीयमानमित्यर्थः । अलोऽन्त्यस्यादेः परस्येत्येतनु वचनसामर्थ्यान्न बाध्यते ॥

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XIII.[1]

(Of the three Guṇa-vowels अ, ए, and ओ, ए comes nearest to the vowel इ so far as the organs of speech are concerned with which both are uttered; and अ is prosodially nearest to इ, because both vowels are short). One might (therefore) say that *e. g.* in the (formation of the) Periph. Future of चि (*i. e.* चेता, where Guṇa has to be substituted for इ), the letter अ on account of its prosodial proximity to the letter short इ likewise ought to be substituted (for this letter, just as ए is substituted for it on account of its proximity of organ). To prevent this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says :

**P. XIII :** Wherever there exist several kinds of proximity[2] (between that for which something else shall be substituted, and its possible substitutes), there the proximity as to the organ of speech is weightier (than the rest, *i. e.* there that only is substituted which is nearest as regards the organs of speech with which both are uttered).

---

1. This Paribhâshâ is given in this place because, like the preceding Paribhâshâ, it treats of substitution, and because it is founded on P. I., 1, 50, which follows immediately on the rule षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा on which the last Paribhâshâ is founded. Some however supply after ननु the words एवमपि which they explain thus, 'although the preceding Paribhâshâ settles the question of what ought to be the *Sthânin* in a substitution, there remain nevertheless some doubts regarding the *Âdes'a*'.

2. *Viz.* which suggest several different substitutes, and which, while they keep off all substitutes that do not bear some proximity to the original, restrict the substitution to only these.

'Several kinds' means, 'as regards the organs of speech, the meaning, the qualities, and prosodial value.' The fact that (Pâṇini) repeats the word स्थाने in the rule I., 1, 50, while by a partial validity (of P. I., 1, 49) the same word स्थाने[1] is valid from P. I., 1, 49, proves this (Paribhâshâ).[2] For this (repetition of स्थाने) conveys, when (the Locative स्थाने) has been transformed[3] into an Instrumental case and when the sentence (स्थाने स्थानेनान्तरतमः) has (in accordance with this transformation) been broken up into two,[4] the following meaning: 'Substituted for something else is that which bears the closest proximity to it; and when (the existence of several kinds of proximity) makes (any choice) possible, only that (is substituted) which bears (the closest) proximity as regards the organ of speech (with which both are uttered).' The[5] very employment of (the

---

1. स्थान in स्थानेग्रहणे is synonymous with प्रसङ्ग; in स्थानेग्रहणम् it denotes 'the place or organ of utterance'.

2. The word एव after स्थानेग्रहणम् shows that this Paribhâshâ is proved by the employment of the word स्थाने in P. I., 1, 50, but is not established by any Jnâpaka.

3. विपरिणमय्य, *scil..* सूचितेन; without this the employment of the Gerund would be improper, for the action which is denoted by the verb that stands in the Gerund must precede another action; literally 'by means of the breaking up of the sentence into two, which is suggested by the transformation of the Locative into the Instrumental case'. If one reads वाक्यभेदेन योज्यम्, it is unnecessary to supply सूचितेन; 'for that (word स्थाने), after one has transformed it into the Instrumental case, has to be joined by Vâkyabheda.'

4. How this is done is shown more clearly by Kaiyaṭa on P. I., 1, 50: स्थानेऽन्तरतमो भवति । यत्र चानेकविधमान्तर्यमस्ति तत्र स्थानकृतमेवान्तर्यमाश्रीयते ।.

5. Now one might say that the Vâkyabheda (which was just now assumed in the explanation of स्थाने स्थानेनान्तरतमः) is useless, because

superlative affix) तमप् (in अन्तरतम 'that which bears the *closest* proximity') proves that there exist (several grades, and proves thus indirectly, that there exist) several kinds of proximity. स्थानतः (in this Paribhâshâ) has the (same) meaning (as) स्थानेन (in स्थाने स्थानेनान्तरतमः).

Of[1] the four kinds of proximity mentioned above the proxi-

---

there is no proof for it that there exist several kinds of proximity; that the word स्थाने (in I., 1, 50) does not prove it, because P. I., 1, 50 may be explained 'that which bears the closest proximity as to the organ of utterance takes in a substitution the place of the original element;' and that according to this explanation of P. I., 1, 50 that rule has no concern with the substitution of the *soshman* and *nâdavat* ध् for the *soshman* and *nâdavat* ह् in तद्धसति for तद् हसति. To meet this objection Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says तमब्ग्रहणमेव 'the very employment of (the superlative affix) तमप्' etc. If there existed only one kind of proximity, viz. proximity of organ, it would have been sufficient for Pâṇini to say in I., 1, 50 अन्तरः, because there exist no various degrees of proximity of organ. When Pâṇini says अन्तरतम: 'that which bears the *closest* proximity' this is intelligible only if his rule I., 1, 50 refers also *e. g.* to proximity of quality, and it proves thus the existence of several kinds of proximity. On this account, and in order to derive from P. I., 1, 50 the command that in तद् हसति not merely a *soshman* (as *e. g.* य्) is to be substituted for the *soshman* ह्; and not merely a *nâdavat* (as *e. g.* द्) for the *nâdavat* ह्, but that a letter which shows the closest proximity, *i. e.* which is both *soshman* and *nâdavat* (*i. e.* ध्) is to take the place of ह्, is the explanation of P. I., 1, 50 by Vâkyabheda absolutely necessary.

1. In each of these examples there exists only one kind of proximity and therefore only the first part of P. I., 1, 50 ('substituted for something else is that which bears the closest proximity to it') applies to them.

mity as regards the organ of utterance is well known (to obtain in such substitutions as are taught) *e. g.* in P. VI., 1, 77.[1] (Proximity) as regards meaning (we see) *e. g.* in P. VI., 1, 63. The (substitutes[2] पद् etc. which are taught in this rule VI., 1, 63) take the place of the words पाद etc. which convey the same meaning and contain (almost) the same letters (as पद् etc.), for by the maxim that that only can become a substitute which has the power to express the meaning of the original, a substitute takes the place of that the meaning of which it is able to express. (Proximity as regards meaning we have) also[3] in P. VII., 1, 95 (and elsewhere; proximity) as regards quality[4] in instances like वाग्घरिः etc. ; prosodial[5] (proximity) in P. VIII., 2, 80 etc.

---

1. Palatal य् is substituted for palatal इ ; labial (or dento-labial) व् for labial उ ; lingual र् for lingual ऋ ; dental ल् for dental ऌ.

2. The original words for which पद् etc. are substituted are not given in P. VI., 1, 63 ; how then are they known ? To answer this question N. says: स्थान्यर्थाभिधान°. ते *i. e.* पदादयः.

3. A second example is given because one might say that P. VI., 1, 63 teaches no real substitution, but draws merely the distinction between पाद etc. and पद् etc. that the former may be used throughout and the latter only in certain cases.—इति च *i. e.* इत्यादौ च. P.

4. गुण 'quality' means here any quality or property (धर्म) not included under the other three heads (of *sthâna*, *artha* and *pramâṇa*). Although the Vâhyaprayatnas, as *vivâra* 'opening' etc., are not really contained in the letters as their properties, nevertheless the letters are metaphorically said to possess those properties.—वाग्घरिः cf. Si. Kau. I., p. 62.

5. Although shortness etc. are really properties (गुण) of letters, they are nevertheless mentioned separately, in the same manner in which one sometimes speaks first of Brâhmans and mentions afterwards Vasishṭha separately although the latter is likewise a Brâhman. Cf. Si. Kau. I., p. 180.

This (Paribhâshâ) is found in the Bhâshya[1] on P. I., 1, 50.

---

1. Extract from the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 50:

अथ स्थान इति वर्तमाने पुनः स्थानग्रहणं किमर्थम् । यत्रानेकविधमान्तर्यं तत्र स्थानत आन्तर्यं बलीयो यथा स्यात् । किं पुनस्तत् । चेता स्तोता । प्रमाणतोऽकारो गुणः प्राप्नोति स्थानत एकारौकारौ । पुनः स्थानग्रहणादेकारौकारौ भवतः ॥ अथ तमब्ग्रहणं किमर्थम् । झयो होऽन्यतरस्याम् [ ८. ४. ६२ ] इति सोष्मणः सोष्माण इति द्वितीयाः प्रसक्ताः । नादवतो नादवन्त इति तृतीयाः प्रसक्ताः । तमब्ग्रहणाद्ये सोष्माणो नादवन्तश्च ते भवन्ति चतुर्थाः । वाग्घसति त्रिष्टुब्भसतीति ॥

Kaiyaṭa: यत्रानेकवीति ॥ स्थानग्रहणेऽनुवर्तमाने वाक्यभेदः क्रियते । स्थानेऽन्तरतमो भवति । यत्र चानेकविधमान्तर्यमस्ति तत्र स्थानकृतमेवान्तर्यमाश्रीयत इति । वाक्यभेदस्य च तमब्ग्रहणमेव लिङ्गम् । स्थानकृत एव हि सादृश्ये गृह्यमाणे सादृश्यान्तरपरित्यागात्तमब्ग्रहणमनर्थकमेव स्यात् ॥ सोष्मण इति । ऊष्मत्वगुणयुक्तस्येत्यर्थः ॥ तमब्ग्रहणादिति । ईषत्सदृशेऽपि लोके सदृशव्यवहारदर्शनादिह तमब्ग्रहणं कृतम् ॥

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XIV.

(Vârttika 3 on P. VI., 1, 89 teaches that, when प्र is combined with following ऊह, ऊढ etc., the Vṛiddhi-vowel औ etc. is substituted for the अ of प्र and the ऊ of ऊह, ऊढ etc.; *e. g.* प्र + ऊढ=प्रौढ). Now one might say that by this Vârttika the Vṛiddhi-vowel (औ) ought (also) in the case of प्र + ऊढवान् (where प्र is likewise followed by ऊढ) to be substituted (for the अ of प्र and the ऊ of ऊढवान्). To prevent this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

**P. XIV:** (A combination of letters capable of) expressing a meaning (denotes), whenever it is employed (in grammar, that combination of letters in so far as it possesses that meaning,

**but it) does not denote (the same combination of letters) void of a meaning.[1]**

This (Paribhâshâ) is based on (the consideration) that whenever it is possible for the meaning which is conveyed when a particular[2] form is employed, to be united (with that form) so as to qualify it, there is no reason why it should be detached (from it). By 'meaning'[3] we have to understand here, as appears from the Bhâshya on P. V., 1, 22,[4] also the grammatical meaning which is assigned (to an affix, a base etc.) because (the meaning of an affix etc.) is assumed to present itself (when the

---

1. Accordingly the term ऊढ in P. VI., 1, 89, 3 does not denote the portion ऊढ of ऊढवान् for here ऊढ is meaningless, ऊढवत् being formed of वह् + तवत्; the Vârttika can therefore not apply to प्र + ऊढवान्.

2. विशिष्ट° *i. e.* वर्णसमूह°. P.

3. Now one might say that अर्थ denotes here what is ordinarily understood by 'meaning' *i. e.*, the *laukikârtha*, and that, as this *laukika* meaning is found only either in a sentence or in complete words, it cannot be ascribed to the base ऊढ, nor *e. g.* to the affix तीय (in a Vârttika on P. I., 1, 33; Si. Kau. I., p. 102); and that consequently this Paribhâshâ can draw no distinction between the base ऊढ of the Past Pass. Ptc. and the portion ऊढ of ऊढवत्, nor between the तीय of द्वितीय and that of पटुजातीय. To meet this objection N. says, 'by meaning' etc.

4. Bhâshya on P. V., 1, 22: संख्याया अतिश° ॥ उतेश्च । उतेश्चेति वक्तव्यम् । इहापि यथा स्यात् । कतिभिः क्रीतं कतिकम् । किं पुनः कारणं न सिध्यति । त्यन्ताया नेति प्रतिषेधः प्राप्नोति । तिप्रतिषेधादुतिग्रहणमिति चेदर्थवद्ग्रहणात्सिद्धम् । अर्थवतस्तिशब्दस्य ग्रहणं न च उतेस्तिशब्दोऽर्थवान् । नैषा परिभाषेह शक्या विज्ञातुं न हि केवलेन प्रत्ययेनार्थो गम्यते । केन तर्हि । सप्रकृतिकेन । क्व तर्ह्येषा परिभाषा भवति । यान्येतानि शब्दसंघातग्रहणानि । तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । अर्थवद्ग्रहणात्सिद्धम् । ननु चोक्तं नैषा परिभाषेह शक्या विज्ञातुं न हि केवलेन प्रत्ययेनार्थो गम्यते केन तर्हि सप्रकृतिकेनेति । केवलेनापि प्रत्ययेनार्थो गम्यते । कथम् । उक्तमन्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्याम् ॥

affix etc. are present) and to be absent (when the latter are absent, and *vice versâ*). As stated in the Bhâshya[1] on P. III., 4, 77, this (Paribhâshâ) does not concern single letters[2] that may be employed (in grammar; and) therefore the ancient (grammarians have said) that it applies wherever particular forms (such as combinations of letters) are enunciated (in a rule). Hereon only is based (the Vârttika) which we read in the Bhâshya on

---

Kaiyaṭa on केवलेनापि ॥ शास्त्रव्यवस्थाहेतुरन्वयव्यतिरेकगम्यार्थवत्ताश्रीयत इत्यर्थः । अत एव शो अर्थवद्ग्रहणात्काशो कुश इत्यादौ शोशब्दस्य ग्रहणाभावः (cf. P. I., 1, 13) । उपसर्गाणामपि केवलानां प्रयोगाभावाल्लौकिक्या अर्थवत्ताया अभावादन्वयव्यतिरेकव्यवस्थाप्यैवासावाश्रीयते ॥

1. Bhâshya on P. III., 4, 77:

लस्य ॥ लादेशे सर्वप्रसङ्गोऽविशेषात् । लादेशे सर्वस्य प्रसङ्गः । सर्वस्य लकारस्यादेशः प्राप्नोति । अस्यापि प्राप्नोति । लुनाति लभते । किं कारणम् । अविशेषात् । न हि कश्चिद्विशेष उपादीयत एवंजातीयस्य लकारस्यादेशो भवतीति । अनुपादीयमाने विशेषे सर्वप्रसङ्गः । अर्थवद्ग्रहणात्सिद्धम् । अर्थवतो लकारस्य ग्रहणम् । न चैषोऽर्थवान् । अर्थवद्ग्रहणात्सिद्धमिति चेन्न वर्णग्रहणेषु । अर्थवद्ग्रहणात्सिद्धमिति चेन्न । किं कारणम् । वर्णग्रहणमिदं न चैतद्वर्णग्रहणेषु भवत्यर्थवद्ग्रहणे नानर्थकस्येति । तस्माद्विशिष्टग्रहणम् । तस्माद्विशिष्टस्य लकारस्य ग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । न कर्तव्यम् । धातोरिति वर्तत इत्यादि ॥

Kaiyaṭa: अर्थवद्ग्रहणादिति । लडादय एव भावाद्यर्थाभिधायिनः स्थानित्वेन गृह्यन्त इत्यर्थः ॥ न वर्णग्रहणेष्विति । लस्येत्यत्र लकारेऽकार उच्चारणार्थस्ततश्च वर्णमात्रस्यायं निर्देशः । वर्णनिर्देशेषु विद्यमानाप्यर्थवत्ता शब्देन नाश्रिता वर्णरूपमात्रस्याश्रयणात् । ततश्च यस्येति लोपोऽनर्थकस्यापि भवति (cf. P. VI., 4, 148) । दैवदत्तिरिति ॥ तस्मादिति । भावाद्यर्थाभिधायिनो लस्येति वक्तव्यमित्यर्थः ॥ धातोरिति वर्तत इति । विहितविशेषणं च धातुग्रहणमाश्रीयत इत्यभिचिल्लभत इत्यत्रापि न भवतीत्यादि ॥.

2. If this Paribhâshâ were applicable to single letters, P. VI., 1, 77 इको यणचि would indeed apply to ई (*i. e.* Lakshmî) + अ (*i. e.* Vishṇu), but not *e. g.* to the final उ of भवतु before the initial इ of इति, because in the latter case उ and इ are meaningless.

P. I., 1, 72,[1] 'that wherever P. I., 1, 72 refers to a meaningless (term), this (term) can only be a single letter,' (or, in other words, that wherever P. I., 1, 72 applies to a combination of letters, this combination of letters can only be such as possesses a meaning[2]).— Moreover (the existence of this Paribhâshâ is also proved thus:) in the rule P. I., 1, 68 the word स्व which means 'one's own' denotes 'the meaning,' (and) the word रूप (denotes) 'the individual form' (of a word), and thus P. I., 1, 68 conveys the sense, that a word denotes both (things expressed by) those (two words स्व and रूप, *viz.* its meaning and its form[3].) The mean-

---

1. Sîradeva and others maintain that there is a second Paribhâshâ न वर्णग्रहणेषु the existence of which they believe to be indicated by P. I., 1, 17 उञः. This rule, they say, is given to prevent (optionally) the substitution of व् for उ in उ+इति, which results from P. VI., 1, 77 इको यणचि; but if the Arthavatparibhâshâ were applicable here, व् could not by P. VI., 1, 77 be substituted for उ before the इ of इति, because this इ has no meaning; consequently P. I., 1, 17 shows that the Arthavatparibhâshâ does not apply here. Or Sîradeva etc. believe the second Paribhâshâ न वर्णग्रहणेषु to be indicated by सप्तम्यर्थे in P. I., 1, 19, *i. e.* by the circumstance that P. VI., 1, 77 has been applied here to the final ई of सप्तमी befor the meaningless अ of अर्थे.

2. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72: अलैवानर्थकेन नान्येनानर्थकेनेति वक्तव्यम् । किं प्रयोजनम् । हन्ग्रहणे प्लीहन्ग्रहणं मा भूदित्यादि ॥

Kaiyaṭa: अर्थवद्ग्रहणे नानर्थकस्येति वर्णनिर्देशेषु नाश्रीयत इति स्थितम् । वर्णरूपतया यस्य शब्दस्याश्रयणं नार्थवत्तारूपमाश्रीयते । तत्र वर्णग्रहणं च सर्वत्रेत्यत्र वर्णग्रहणे जातिग्रहणाद्वर्णसमुदायग्रहणेऽप्यनर्थकस्य ग्रहणं प्राप्तमनेनै निवार्यते ॥ अलैवेति चैकत्वसंख्या गुणत्वाद्विवक्ष्यते नियमविधानसामर्थ्याद्वा ॥ हन्ग्रहण इति । तेन प्लीहानाविति दीर्घो भवति ॥

3. P. explains तदुभयम् by 'the two things denoted by the two words

1. Ed. om. ग्रहणेऽप्यनर्थकस्य. 2. Ed. °नेन नियमेन.

ing can here not be qualified (by the form) because no grammatical operation can possibly take place in the meaning; on the contrary, the meaning qualifies the word-(form); and, this being the case, the sense which results (from P. I., 1., 68) is this that (a word) denotes a certain word-form qualified by (or, possessed of) a meaning. Hereby,[1] as appears from the Bhâshya, (the existence of) this Paribhâshâ is established.

---

used in *that* Sûtra (I., 1, 68)'; or by 'the two things denoted by *those* two words स्व and रूप'; he also says that the reading एतदुभयम् is easy.

1. तेन *i. e.* 'by that rule (P. I., 1, 68) the meaning of which has been given'.—Now one might say that the existence of this Paribhâshâ cannot be established by P. I., 1, 68, because this rule has been rejected. On this account Nâgojîbhaṭṭa adds इति भाष्ये *i. e.* इत्यादि भाष्ये स्पष्टम्. This shows that, in case P. I., 1, 68 be rejected, this Paribhâshâ is established only by the first proof adduced for it, 'विशिष्टरूपोपादाने–मानाभावः'.—Cf. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 68: स्वं रूपं शब्दस्याशब्दसंज्ञा । रूपग्रहणं किमर्थं न शब्दस्य स्वमित्येव रूपं शब्दस्य संज्ञा भविष्यति । न ह्यन्यत्स्वं शब्दस्यास्ति । अन्यदतो रूपात् । एवं तर्हि सिद्धे सति यद्रूपग्रहणं करोति तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यः । अस्त्यन्य-द्रूपात्स्वं शब्दस्येति । किं पुनस्तत् । अर्थः । किमेतस्य ज्ञापने प्रयोजनम् । अर्थवद्ग्रहणे नानर्थकस्येति परिभाषा न कर्तव्या भवतीत्यादि ॥

1. Ed. न स्वं शब्दस्याशब्दसंज्ञा भवतीत्येव.

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XV.

(P. VI., 3, 46 teaches that आ is substituted for the final of महत् when the latter is compounded with a word which, in case the compound were dissolved, would stand in the same case as महत्; *e. g.* महादेवः, महाबाहुः). Now one might say that by this rule आ ought to have been substituted (for the final of महत् also in

the formation of महद्भूतः which occurs) in (such phrases as) महद्भूतश्चन्द्रमाः 'the moon which has as it were become great';[1] (for although according to Paribh. XIV. महत् in P. VI., 3, 46 cannot denote any meaningless महत्, it does denote महत् wherever this word possesses a meaning which is the case in महद्भूतश्चन्द्रमाः). To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

P. XV: When a word besides its primary meaning possesses a secondary meaning, an operation (which may be taught in grammar concerning this word) takes effect (only) when the latter conveys its primary (but not, when it conveys its secondary) meaning.

गौण 'secondary' (derived from गुण by P. IV., 3, 74,) means 'derived from a quality'; *e. g.* the word गो 'ox' conveys the (secondary) meaning 'one who is only fit for bearing burdens, an unintelligent person', because (such a person has) certain qualities such as stupidity etc. (in common with an ox. Occasionally) we also make (a word) denote something which in reality is not (what that word denotes originally, but) to which the word is applied as a name,[2] solely because the qualities of that (which the word originally denotes) are ascribed to it;[3]

---

1. महद्भूतः does not mean that the moon has actually become great, but it means that the quality of greatness, which the moon in reality does not possess, has been ascribed to it. Cf. Si. Kau. I, p. 729, note 45.

2. संज्ञादिः is explained by संज्ञा आदिः प्रथमो बोधकोऽस्येत्यर्थः । तथा च संज्ञाबोध्य इति फलितम् ॥

3. *E. g.* the word रघुनाथ may as a name denote any man, not because he is 'a chief of the Raghus' but because he is supposed to have certain qualities in common with Râma, the real lord of the Raghus.

(the meaning which a word conveys in the latter case, is likewise called a 'secondary' meaning). मुख्य (derived from मुख by P. V., 3, 103) means 'as it were the head,' because it is the main (sense), 'first,' 'primary';[1] for a word which is employed in a secondary sense, is so employed (only) because (the character of that which it denotes in) its primary sense is ascribed (to that which it denotes in its secondary sense).[2] And thus, so far as this (Paribhâshâ) is concerned, a word is गौण 'secondary' when that which is denoted by it is in reality not (what is denoted by the word in its primary sense, *i. e.* when the word is used merely as a name), and also when the word metaphorically denotes a person or thing on account of certain qualities (which the latter has in common with that which is expressed by the word in its primary sense). Accordingly the substitution of त्रय (for त्रि which is taught in P. VII., 1, 53) does take place in (the Gen. Plur. of प्रियत्रि and we obtain thus) प्रियत्रयाणाम् 'of persons to whom three are dear' etc. because, although the meaning of the word त्रि qualifies here something else (*viz.* the persons to whom three are dear, and is therefore in a certain sense secondary,) it is not secondary in the sense in which this term is used in this Paribhâshâ.[3] Besides, the maxim (which is ex-

1. The words are likewise मुख्य 'primary' or गौण 'secondary' according as they convey a primary or a secondary meaning.

2. And in order that this may be possible, the primary meaning must necessarily exist 'first.'

3. The author of the Vârttikas has for this reason in connection with P. I., 1, 27 given the prohibitory rule, that सर्व etc. when they are in compounds *Upasarjana*, are not to be called सर्वनामानि. If an *Upasarjana* were secondary in the sense in which this term is used here, the application of the term *Sarvanâman* to सर्व etc. in cases where these words

pressed by) this (Paribhâshâ) has nothing to do with an operation which concerns the crude form (of a word), but it refers only to an operation which concerns a (complete) word, provided that (in the rule which teaches this operation) a particular word-form, that conveys some individual meaning, is (either valid from a preceding rule or) enunciated (as that which is liable to undergo the operation which is taught in the rule).[1] The reason why (this Paribhâshâ) has nothing to do with an operation that concerns a crude form, is namely this that (a word) conveys a secondary meaning (only) when, after its formation has been completed,[2] it is combined with another word, as *e. g.* (गो 'ox') in गोवाहीकः 'an ox only fit to bear burdens, an unintelligent person,' but not at the time when its crude form is liable to undergo grammatical operations, and that therefore the changes which, because they (are *antaranga, i. e.*) apply first, have taken place already (when this Paribhâshâ is applicable), cannot be prevented (by the latter).

---

are *Upasarjana* would be prohibited by this Paribhâshâ, and need not have been forbidden by a special rule.

1. If, in order to guard against too wide an application of this Paribhâshâ, it had been said to apply only to an operation or rule in which a *Pada* is the उद्देश्य *i. e.*, that which is liable to undergo the operation, the Paribhâshâ would not have been applicable *e. g.* to P. IV., 1, 137 राजश्वशुराद्यत् and would not have prevented the addition of the affix यत्, which is taught in that rule, to श्वशुर when this word denotes metaphorically 'one who resembles a father-in-law.' Nor would it have been applicable to P. I., 1, 15, ; (see below).—As विशिष्टरूपम् has the same sense which this word had in the preceding Paribhâshâ, and as उद्देश्यम् has to be supplied after it, the meaning of विशिष्टरूपम् is वर्णसमूहात्मकरूपमुद्देश्यम्.

2. According to the maxim स्वार्थे परिपूर्णमर्थान्तरमाकाङ्क्षते.

The words[1] 'provided that—enunciated' (are employed above) in order (that the Paribhâshâ may not be applicable *e. g.* to P. IV., 1, 95 अत इञ्, or, in other words, in order to show) that in such derivatives as श्वाशुरि meaning 'the descendant of one who resembles a father-in-law' the affix इञ् which is taught in P. IV., 1, 95, has been correctly added (to श्वशुर 'one who resembles a father-in-law'). Nor can one say that the word प्रातिपदिक (which is valid in P. IV., 1, 95, the meaning of this rule being 'अदन्तात्प्रातिपदिकात्' etc.) fulfils the condition expressed in the words 'provided—enunciated' (and that therefore the Paribhâshâ ought to have been applied to P. IV., 1, 95, and ought to have prevented the formation of श्वाशुरि in the sense of 'the descendant of one who resembles a father-in-law'); for that (word 'Prâtipadika') does not convey any individual meaning, because it tells us only that something termed 'Prâtipadika' (undergoes the operation taught in P. IV., 1, 95). The word[2] निपात, on the other hand, denotes (because

---

1. श्वशुर in its primary sense means 'a father-in-law,' in a secondary sense 'one who resembles a father-in-law.' Pâṇini teaches in IV., 1, 137 राजश्वशुराद्यत्, that the affix यत् is added to श्वशुर in the sense of 'a descendant.' The addition of this affix concerns a complete word, viz. the word श्वशुरस्य in श्वशुरस्यापत्यम्, and besides the particular word-form श्वशुर which conveys an individual meaning, is given in the rule which teaches its addition. Consequently the present Paribhâshâ applies in this case and prevents the addition of यत् to श्वशुर in the secondary sense 'one who resembles a father-in-law.' But the Paribhâshâ does not apply to P. IV., 1, 95 अत इञ्.

2. To obviate the objection that if this Paribhâshâ is not applicable to P. IV., 1, 95, it can likewise not be applicable to P. I., 1, 15 ओत्, Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says निपातपदं तु 'the word Nipâta, on the other hand.' In गोभवत्, गो has a secondary meaning because गोभवत् conveys the sense that somebody who is not an ox became similar to an ox; when a

this term has been assigned to the individual words च etc. which have all been enumerated in the Gaṇa चादि) the words च etc. just as they are (each of them individually) enumerated in the Gaṇa चादि; accordingly the present (Paribhâshâ) does apply in rules like P. I., 1, 15 that teach an operation to which Nipâtas are subject, and there is consequently nothing strange in (the fact that by this Paribhâshâ the ओ of गो) in गोभवत् 'he became like an ox' (from गो + अभवत्, has notwithstanding the rule P. I., 1, 15, not been regarded as *pragṛihya*.)

When the word अग्नीषोम which denotes the two gods who really are (Agni and Soma) is in अग्नीषोमौ माणवकौ 'two men Agni and Soma' applied to (two men) who resemble Agni and Soma, ई and ष् (that have been substituted for the इ of अग्नि, and the स् of सोम by P. VI., 3, 27 and P. VIII., 3, 82,) remain because they (are *antaranga, i. e.*) have been substituted before (अग्नीषोम received a secondary meaning. But) in the formation of a Dvandva-compound of the two words अग्नि and सोम employed metaphorically to denote (two men) who resemble (Agni and Soma), and (in the formation of a Dvandva-compound) in the sense of 'a man named Agni and a man named Soma,' ष् is not substituted (for the स् of सोम),[1] because in the former case

---

person by a curse etc. is really changed into an ox P. V., 4, 50 is not applicable.—Râghavendra makes the following remarks: निपातपदमिति । ननु चादीनां तथोपस्थित्योपतिष्ठतां नाम तदंश एषा च्व्यन्तस्य तु न तथेति कथं तत्र विशिष्टरूपोपादानम् । किंच प्रकृतावारोपेण वर्तमानादेव च्विविधानेन तस्य न मुख्यगौणार्थसंगतिर्भवति । किंचैवं निपातो ह्रस्वकार्यमात्रे च्व्यन्तस्याग्रहणापत्तिरिति चेत् । अत्र केचित् । चाद्यंशे विशिष्टरूपोपादानमात्रेण प्रवृत्ता परिभाषांशान्तरमप्यनुगृह्णाति । कार्यान्तरे त्वनित्यत्वादस्याप्रवृत्तिरिति ॥

1. The substitution of ई for the इ of अग्नि is not prevented by this Paribhâshâ; it cannot possibly take place because the compound of अग्नि

(the words अग्नि and सोम) are metaphorically applied to two men on account of their having certain qualities in common (with the gods Agni and Soma), and because in the latter case the two men are not really Agni and Soma (but are only named thus). Consequently the (author of the) Bhâshya on P. VIII., 3, 82 is[1] right in preventing the substitution of ष् for स् in अग्निसोमौ माणवकौ by the maxim conveyed in this Paribhâshâ.

Although[2] persons who employ such phrases as गां पाठय 'make

---

and सोम is in this case no *Devatâdvandva;* (cf. P. VI., 3, 27). The reading नेत्त्वषत्वे has to be explained: 'ई is not substituted for the इ of अग्नि because the compound is no *Devatâdvandva,* and the substitution of ष् for the स् of सोम is prevented by this Paribhâshâ.'

1. Cf. Bhâshya on P. VIII., 3, 82: अग्नेर्दीर्घात्सोमस्य। अग्नेर्दीर्घात्सोमस्येति वक्तव्यम्। अग्नीषोमौ। इतरथा ह्यनिष्टप्रसङ्गः। इतरथा ह्यनिष्टं प्रसज्येत। अग्निसोमौ माणवकाविति। तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम्। न वक्तव्यम्। गौणमुख्ययोर्मुख्ये संप्रतिपत्तिः। तद्यथा गौरनुबन्ध्योऽजोऽग्नीषोमीय इति न वाहीकोऽनुबध्यते। कथं तर्हि वाहीके वृद्ध्यात्त्वे भवतः। गौस्तिष्ठति गामानयेति॥ अर्थाश्रय एतदेवं भवति। यद्धि शब्दाश्रयं शब्दमात्रे तद्भवति। शब्दाश्रये च वृद्ध्यात्त्वे॥

Kaiyata: गौणमुख्ययोरिति। लौकिक एवायं न्यायः शास्त्र आश्रीयते। स्वं रूपं शब्दस्येति रूपग्रहणादर्थवद्रूपमाश्रीयते स चार्थो मुख्य एव गृह्यते न तु गौणः। तत्र प्रसिद्ध्यप्रसिद्धिभ्यां मुख्यगौणव्यवस्थेति माणवके संज्ञात्वेन विनियुक्तावग्निसोमशब्दौ गौणार्थाविति षत्वाभावः॥ शब्दाश्रये चेति। प्रातिपदिकस्य वृद्ध्यात्त्वे। प्रातिपदिकं तु न लौकिकेनार्थवत्त्वेनान्वयव्यतिरेकाभ्यां कल्पितेन। तस्यां चावस्थायां लौकिकार्थत्वाभावाद्गौणमुख्याभावाद्रूपमात्राश्रयं कार्यं प्रवर्तते तस्मिन्प्रवृत्ते मुख्येऽर्थे गौणे वार्थे प्रयोगः। अथवा शब्दो न कदाचित्स्वार्थपरित्यागेनार्थान्तरे प्रवर्तते। अर्थस्त्वर्थान्तरे समारोपितो यदा शब्दप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तं भवति तदा गौणव्यवहारः। तत्र प्रातिपदिकं स्वार्थ एव वर्तमानं वृद्ध्यात्त्वे प्रतिपद्यते पश्चात्तु पदार्थान्तरारोपितस्वार्थस्य गौणत्वमिति पदाश्रयेष्वेव कार्येषु गौणमुख्यव्यवस्थाश्रयणम्॥

2. In order to account for the Acc. गाम् in such phrases as गां वाहीकमानय 'fetch the stupid ox', one might say that, as the Accusative termination

the ox read' etc., at the time when they add the (Accusative) termination (to गो etc.) are aware that (this crude form) conveys here a secondary meaning because that which is denoted by the primary meaning (of गो, viz. a real ox,) cannot become the object of 'causing to read', nevertheless to the hearers everywhere only a complete word conveys a secondary meaning because only complete words are employed in the language. On this account and because in such passages of the Bhâshya as अत्वं त्वं संपद्यते 'one who is not you becomes (like) you', अमहान्महान्भूतः 'one who is not great, has become (as it were) great,' त्वद्भवति 'he is (like) you' etc., the substitutes त्व etc. (which are taught in P. VII., 2, 94; 97) and the long vowel (आ which according to P. VI., 4, 10 is substituted for the अ of महत्) etc. have actually been substituted (although त्वम् etc. convey a secondary meaning), it is proper to say that this Paribhâshâ applies only to operations which concern complete words. Other-

---

is added to गो in order to denote the particular relation which obtains between 'ox, and 'fetching', and as there is so far no indication of गो conveying a secondary meaning, there is no reason why the form गाम् should not be formed, and that afterwards when गाम् is combined with वाहीकम्, it must remain unchanged although गो in this combination does convey a secondary meaning. One might further maintain that the case is different in phrases like गां वाहीकं पाठय 'make the stupid ox read', because here गो must convey a secondary meaning already at the time when the Accusative termination is added to it. For this Acc. termination denotes a relation between 'ox' and 'causing to read'; such a relation, however, is impossible unless गो conveys a secondary meaning from the very beginning. Consequently the Paribhâshâ ought here to apply at the time when the Acc. termination is added to गो and ought to prevent the formation of गाम्. To meet this objection Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says 'although persons' etc.

wise (*i. e.* if the Paribhâshâ did apply also to such operations as concern crude forms, it would in phrases like 'make the ox read,' etc. prevent the substitution of आ etc. in the Accusative of गो etc. and in that case) those (आ etc.) would not appear in the (phrases गां पाठय etc.) at the time when (the Accusative of गो etc.) are combined to form a sentence.

Moreover (we can prove that not merely the hearer but) also the speaker apprehends a secondary meaning only in a complete word (as *e. g.* in गाम्, viz.) at the time when he combines (this word गाम्) with (the verb which expresses) the action of 'causing to read' (and that he does not apprehend it in the crude form गो at the time when he adds the Accusative termination). The (author of the) Bhâshya on P. I., 2, 45 remarks namely that when we say शुक्लाम् 'a white (cow)' we specify (by doing so) an object, but specify neither an agent nor an action etc.,[1] and he goes on to say, that when saying 'Devadatta brought a black cow', we specify everything, viz. we show that only 'a cow' is the object, only 'Devadatta' the agent, only 'he brought' the action. The purport (of this passage of the Bhâshya) is this that, while, when a noun with a certain case-termination etc. is employed by itself, all verbs which govern that case may be supplied, the (actual) employment of a (particular) verb etc. serves

1. इत्यादि etc. implies that, when we say देवदत्त, we specify by doing so an agent, but specify neither an object nor an action, and when we say अभ्याज, we specify an action, but specify neither an agent nor an object.—The Bhâshya, Kaiyaṭa, and Pâyaguṇḍa read the Vocative case देवदत्त, and Kaiyaṭa remarks on the words कर्ता निर्दिष्टः of the Bhâshya, संबोधनविषयमनियतक्रियं कर्तृमात्रमित्यर्थः. One would have expected rather the Nominative case देवदत्तः.—After सर्वं निर्दिष्टम् supply इत्युक्तेन (viz. भाष्येण ).

the purpose of restricting (the dependence of the case to this one verb.) Herefrom we learn that, when we wish to denote (*e. g.*) merely the seat of that which accrues from an action in general (without reference to any particular action) we rightly employ the Accusative case etc. (by P. II., 3, 2 etc. The Accusative case गाम् is consequently formed before गो is brought into connection with the particular action of 'causing to read' or, in other words, before even the speaker apprehends the secondary meaning of गो.—As this Paribhâshâ)[1] so the verse 'when they are so employed that their meaning is manifest etc.' which is based on this (Paribhâshâ), refers likewise to operations that concern complete words.

And this (circumstance that the present Paribhâshâ refers to operations which concern complete words) has (also) been indicated[2] by the author of the Vârttikas when he on P. I., 1, 27

1. This Nâgojîbhaṭṭa adds in order to refute the erroneous opinion that the maxim which is expressed in the verse अभिव्यक्तपदार्था ये etc. is a separate Paribhâshâ. The whole verse runs thus:

अभिव्यक्तपदार्था ये प्रसिद्धा लोकविश्रुताः ।
शास्त्रार्थस्तेषु कर्तव्यः शब्देषु न तदुक्तिषु ॥

'An operation which (concerning certain words) is taught in a rule takes effect in these words, when they are so employed that their meaning is manifest (in that which they denote *e. g.* when गो denotes a real ox), when that which they denote is actually what they express (*e. g.* when रघुनाथ denotes Râma who is really a chief of the Raghus), and is generally known to be so, but not when they, (destitute of their original meaning), are employed as mere names.'

2. *Viz.* because the remarks of the author of the Vârttikas etc. would be superfluous if the Paribh. did refer to operations which concern crude forms.

makes the prohibitory statement that सर्व etc. when they are employed as names are not to be termed (*Sarvanâmâni*), and by the author of the Sûtras when he in I., 1, 34 says असंज्ञायाम् 'not when they are names', and also by the author of the Bhâshya when he rejects both (the Vârttika on P. I., 1, 27 and the word असंज्ञायाम् in P. I., 1, 34) by saying that (the term सर्वनामानि) is a term the application of which accords with its meaning (*i. e.* by explaining it to mean सर्वेषां नामानि.)[1]

The (passage of the) Bhâshya[2] on P. I., 1, 15 'so it is with that which is based on the meaning, whereas Vṛiddhi and आ (in गौः and गाम्; see P. VII, 1, 90; VI., 1, 93) are based on the word-form,' has this sense: 'the maxim (expressed by this

---

1. Cf. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 27; Edit. pag. 449.

संज्ञोपसर्जनप्रतिषेधः। संज्ञोपसर्जनीभूतानां सर्वादीनां प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः। सर्वो नाम कश्चित्तस्मै सर्वाय देहि।....। स कथं कर्तव्यः। पाठात्पर्युदासः पठितानां संज्ञाकरणम्। पाठादेव पर्युदासः कर्तव्यः। शुद्धानां पठितानां संज्ञा कर्तव्या। सर्वादीनि सर्वनामसंज्ञानि भवन्ति। संज्ञोपसर्जनीभूतानि न सर्वादीनि।....संज्ञाप्रतिषेधस्तावन्न वक्तव्यः। उपरिष्टाद्योगविभागः करिष्यते। पूर्वपरावरदक्षिणोत्तरापराधराणि व्यवस्थायाम। ततोऽसंज्ञायामिति। सर्वादीनीत्येवं यान्यनुक्रान्तान्यसंज्ञायां तानि द्रष्टव्यानि॥..........अथवा महती संज्ञा क्रियते संज्ञा च नाम यतो न लघीयः। कुत एतत्। लघ्वर्थं हि संज्ञाकरणम्। तत्र महत्याः संज्ञायाः करण एतत्प्रयोजनम्। अन्वर्थसंज्ञा यथा विज्ञायेत। सर्वादीनि सर्वनामसंज्ञानि भवन्ति। सर्वेषां नामानीति चातः सर्वनामानि। संज्ञोपसर्जने च विशेषेऽवतिष्ठेते॥..........

Kaiyaṭa: यतो न लघीय इति। शब्दव्यवहारो लघुः। ततोऽपि लघीयो नाम तत्र गुरुसंज्ञाकरणात्सर्वादीनां विशिष्टो धर्मोऽनुमीयते नूनमेतानि संज्ञाप्रवृत्तिनिमित्तेन सर्वनामत्वेन युक्तानि यतस्तदनुरूपा तेषां संज्ञा कृतेति सर्वनामकार्यमन्तर्गणकार्यं च सर्वनामत्वयुक्तानामेव भवति न संज्ञोपसर्जनानाम॥

2. Cf. the Bhâshya on P. VIII., 3, 82 quoted above pag. 91. It is almost identical with the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 15.

Paribhâshâ) concerns words which are fit to bear the meaning which words convey in common life, whereas those (Vṛiddhi and आ) concern the word-form which (as a crude form) is (still) void of that [1] (fitness to bear the meaning which words convey in common life);' this is the only possible explanation of the above (passage of the) Bhâshya[2] because in P. VII., 1, 90, according to the actual reading of that rule, a particular word-form (viz. गो) has actually been given. Sapienti sat.

1. तद्रहित° *i. e.* लौकिकार्थवत्त्वयोग्यत्वसमानाधिकरणपदत्वरहित°. P.

2. And शब्दाश्रये cannot be explained by 'concerning merely letters which have no meaning'.—The actual reading गोतः, and not ओतः, is the proper reading in P. VII., 1, 90.

---

## Paribhâshâ XVI.

(The author of the Paribhâshâs) mentions the following exception[1] to Paribhâshâ XIV:

**P. XVI:** Wherever अन् or इन् or अस् or मन्, when they are employed (in grammar), denote (by P. I., 1, 72) something that ends with अन् or इन् or अस् or मन्, there (अन्, इन्, अस्, and मन्) represent (these combinations of letters) both in so

1. Paribhâshâ XVI. is separated from Paribhâshâ XIV., although it forms an exception to it, because the intervening Paribhâshâ XV. is really only a part of Paribhâshâ XIV. As Paribhâshâ XIV. concerns the meaning, and as the meaning may be two-fold, primary and secondary, it was necessary to ascertain which meaning should be understood, before an exception to Paribhâshâ. XIV. could be given.

far as they possess, and also in so far as they are void of, a meaning.[1]

This (Paribhâshâ) is in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72 given verbatim in the form of a Vârttika.[2] Accordingly (the substitution of) Lopa for the अ (of अन् of nouns ending in अन्, which is taught in P. VI., 4, 134) takes place (not merely) in the Instr. Sing. (etc.) of राजन् (but also in that) of सामन् etc. (although in सामन् अन्, being only part of the affix मन्, is void of meaning); similarly the restriction (regarding the substitution of ई for the इ of इन् of nouns ending in इन्) which is taught in P. VI., 4, 12; 13, concerns (not merely) दण्डिन्, (but also) वाग्मिन् etc. (although इन् possesses a meaning only in दण्डिन्, which is formed with the affix इन्, and is meaningless in वाग्मिन् where it forms only part of the affix); similarly (the substitution of) long (आ for the अ of अस् of nouns ending in अस्, which is taught in P. VI., 4, 14) takes place (not merely) in the Nom. Sing. of सुपयस् (but also in that) of सुस्रोतस्[3] etc. (although the अस् in सुस्रोतस् is void of

1. 'Meaning' can here only be 'the grammatical meaning', *viz.* the meaning which grammarians assign to the affixes अन् etc.

2. It is neither established by a Jnâpaka nor based on a Nyâya.—Cf. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72: अनिनस्मन्ग्रहणान्यर्थवता चानर्थकेन च तदन्तविधिं प्रयोजयन्ति । अन् । राज्ञेत्यर्थवता साम्नेत्यनर्थकेन । इन् । दण्डीत्यर्थवता वाग्मीत्यनर्थकेन । अस् । सुपया इत्यर्थवता सुस्रोता इत्यनर्थकेन । मन् । सुशर्मेत्यर्थवता सुप्रथिमेत्यनर्थकेन ॥ Kaiyaṭa: सुस्रोता इति । अनागमकानां सागमका आदेशा इत्याश्रयणादस्ति आनर्थक्यमर्थवतो ह्यागम इति न्यायाश्रयणे त्वर्थवानेवास्शब्दः ॥

3. When the affix अस् has received the augment त्, only the combination तस् possesses a meaning, according to the maxim अनागमकानां सागमका आदेशाः; the same results also from the maxim that, when an augment has been added to any term, only both combined convey a

13

a meaning); and the prohibition of the addition of (the feminine affix) ङीप् (to nouns ending in मन्) which is taught in P. IV., 1, 11, applies (not merely) to सुशर्मन् (but also to) सुप्रथिमन् etc. (although in the second instance मन्, being only part of the affix इमन्, is meaningless).

Others[1] however maintain that, because Pâṇini, in order to prevent the substitution of ढ् (for the ध् of षीध्वम्) in परिवेविषीध्वम्[2], employs in VIII., 3, 78 the word अङ्गात्, Paribhâshâ XIV. is not universally valid, and that that (for which we have accounted by this Paribhâshâ XVI.) has its cause in that (partial invalidity of Paribh. XIV. which has thus been indicated by Pâṇini).

Others, (and with these we agree), say that अङ्गात् (in P. VIII.,

meaning. Kaiyaṭa (cf. last note) who maintains that by the maxim अर्थवतो ह्यागमः अस् in स्रोतस् possesses a meaning, and who implies thereby that according to this view सुस्रोताः is no proper example, is hereby refuted.

1. अन्ये तु; प्राञ्च इत्यर्थः P.

2. परिवेविषीध्वम् is the 2. pers. plur. Potent. Âtm. of rt. विष् with परि; षीध्वम् has no meaning in this form because it is made up of ष्, *i. e.* the final letter of the root, and of the termination ईध्वम्. In instances like च्योषीढ्वम्, *i. e.* च्यो + षीध्वम्, on the other hand, षीध्वम् does possess a meaning because it is all termination. P. VIII., 3, 78 teaches that the ध् of षीध्वम् when it follows an Anga that ends with any one of the letters contained in the Pratyâhâra इण्, is changed to ढ्; he says 'when it follows an Anga' in order to prevent the application of his rule to वेविषीध्वम्; here we likewise have षीध्वम्, but this षीध्वम् does not follow an Anga and consequently its ध् cannot be changed to ढ्. If Paribhâshâ XIV. were here valid the word अङ्गात् in P. VIII., 3, 78 would be superfluous, because the combination of letters षीध्वम् in that rule would denote only षीध्वम् when possessed of a meaning *i. e.* the termination षीध्वम् in च्यो+षीध्वम etc., but it would not denote the meaningless षीध्वम् of परिवेविषीध्वम्.

3, 78) serves the purpose of guarding against the erroneous supposition that षिध्वम्, as it in P. VIII., 3, 79 can only be void of meaning (on account of its being part of इषिध्वम्[1] which only as a whole possesses a meaning), might also in P. VIII., 3, 78 denote only that (meaningless combination of letters षिध्वम्.)[2]

1. इषिध्वम् and षिध्वम् bear the same relation towards each other as तस् and अस् in the above सुक्तोतस्.

2. Paribhâshâ XIV. is consequently in no way invalidated by the word अङ्गात् in P. VIII., 3, 78 and in order to account for the forms साम्ना etc. we must adopt Paribh. XVI.—Nor can one maintain that by Paribhâshâ XIV. षिध्वम् ought not to be supplied in P. VIII., 3, 79, because it would be meaningless in the latter rule, and that therefore the word अङ्गात् in P. VIII., 3, 78, as it can in this case not possibly convey the meaning which the परे ascribe to it, can only indicate the invalidity of Paribh. XIV. This view is wrong because according to Paribh. XVII. षिध्वम् *must* together with लुङ् and लिट् be supplied in P. VIII., 3, 79. P.

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XVII.

One might say that, because (of the several words in P. I., 2, 11 only the one word) आत्मनेपदेषु stands immediately near (P. I., 2, 12), only this word ought from P. I., 2, 11 (to be valid, or in other words) to be connected (with the words) in P. I., 2, 12, (and that the other words लिङ्सिचौ of P. I., 2, 11 ought not to be valid in P. I., 2, 12). To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

**P. XVII: When several words of a rule are (mutually) connected, they either are *all* valid (in a subsequent rule) or *none* of them is valid.**

The word वा has the sense of एव 'only.'[1] The meaning (of the Paribhâshâ is this) that words, the meanings of which are mutually connected,[2] must (as the case may be) either *all* be valid, or *all* cease to be valid (in a subsequent rule; *i. e.* when one is valid the others also are valid, and when one ceases to be valid the others likewise cease to be valid).[3] Such is the case because the very same (practice) is observed in common life when several people are appointed to the same office; (*viz.* they all have to act in one and the same manner.[4] Some) maintain that the repetition in P. VII., 2, 35 of (the term) इट्, which occurs in the previous rule P. VII., 2, 8 and might have been (regarded as) valid in P. VII., 2, 35, indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ); for (they say that) इट् is repeated for the purpose of showing that the word न (of P. VII., 2, 8, which by this Paribhâshâ would be valid in VII., 2, 35 together

---

1. P. विकल्पान्वयासंभवादाह वाशब्द इति । जातावेकवचनं वाशब्दावित्यर्थः। वा स्याद्विकल्पोपमयोरेवार्थे इति कोषादिति भावः ॥ वा एवार्थे इति पाठान्तरम् ॥. I have translated वा—वा by 'either—or'.

2. This shows that the word योग in एकयोगनिर्दिष्टानाम is synonymous with संबन्ध, and not with सूत्र; if योग did denote here 'a grammatical rule' *all* the words of a rule would either be valid or cease to be valid, even though their meanings might not be mutually connected, which is not the case.

3. If therefore the word आत्मनेपदेषु of P. I., 2, 11 is valid in P. I., 2, 12, लिङ्सिचौ must likewise be valid in the latter rule.

4. This Paribhâshâ is consequently based on a generally recognized maxim. The opinion of Sîradeva and others who maintain that its existence is indicated by the employment of सिच् in P. I., 2, 14, which, they say, would be superfluous if this Paribhâshâ did not exist because in that case सिच् alone might be valid in P. I., 2, 14 from P. I., 2, 11, is herewith rejected.

with इट्) must not be connected (with the words of P. VII., 2, 35.)[1] But this is wrong; for it is contrary to (a passage in) the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 6 where, in order to show that we can dispense with the इट् in P. I., 1, 6, it has been stated that the repetition of इट् (in P. VII., 2, 35), notwithstanding that इट् is valid (from P. VII., 2, 8) is intended to show that the augment इ is not liable to undergo a Guṇa-change.[2] (The इट् of P. VII., 2, 8 *is* therefore valid in P. VII., 2, 35);[3] on the other hand, the fact that न (of P. VII., 2, 8 which according to this Paribhâshâ ought to be valid together with इट्) is no longer valid (in P. VII., 2, 35), is accounted for by the maxim expressed in Paribhâshâ XVIII.—Really, however, the (above-mentioned passage from the) Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 6 contains the view of one who is only partly acquainted with the true state

---

1. If this Paribhâshâ did not exist, इट् alone might be supplied from P. VII., 2, 8 in P. VII., 2, 35, and the actual repetition of इट in the latter rule would be superfluous. But as this Paribh. does exist, इट् cannot be supplied without the न in connection with which it occurs in P. VII., 2, 8; its repetiton in P. VII., 2, 35 is therefore necessary, and indicates at the same time the existence of the Paribhâshâ.

2. The repetition of इट् would therefore not be superfluous even if this Paribhâshâ did not exist, and consequently it cannot indicate the existence of this Paribhâshâ.

Cf. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 6: इटश्चापि ग्रहणं शक्यमकर्तुम् | कथमकणिषमरणिषं कणिता श्वो रणिता श्व इति | आर्धधातुकस्येड्वलादेरित्यत्रेडिति वर्तमाने पुनरिड्ग्रहणस्य प्रयोजनमिडेव यथा स्याद्यदन्यत्प्राप्नोति तन्मा भूदिति | किं चान्यत्प्राप्नोति | गुणः ||

3. इट् is really valid in P. VII., 2, 35 from P. VII., 2, 8, and it is repeated merely in order to show that Guṇa cannot be substituted for the augment इ. Why then is the न of P. VII., 2, 8 not likewise valid in P. VII., 2, 35? This question is answered by 'on the other hand' etc.

of the case; for in the Bhâshya[1] on P. VII., 2, 8 it has been shown, that the term इट् is superfluous in P. VII., 2, 35 (and not in P. I., 1, 6; and this must be regarded as the correct view of the matter) because it is improper to reject the इट् of P. I., 1, 6 by means of retaining इट् in P. VII., 2, 35 when in doing so we are obliged to have recourse to rather too artificial an explanation[2] (of the latter.)

---

1. Cf. Bhâshya on P. VII., 2, 8: इडस्मिन् । नेड्वशि कृति । ततो वक्ष्यामि । आर्धधातुकस्य वलादेरिति । इडित्यनुवर्तते । नेति निवृत्तम्. ॥

2. Viz. by assuming it to indicate that the augment इ never undergoes a Guna-change.

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XVIII.

Now (one might object that, if the preceding Paribhâshâ were really adopted), it would be improper to say that (the term) अलुक् (of P. VI., 3, 1) is valid as far as P. VI., 3, 24 and (the term) उत्तरपदे (of the same rule) as far as P. VI., 3, 139; because (अलुक् and उत्तरपदे) in the rule (P. VI.. 3, 1) are (mutually) connected; and that it would for the same reason be improper that in P. IV., 1, 27 etc. (only the part) संख्यादेः should be valid from P. IV., 1, 26 and that अव्ययादेः should cease to be valid. (The author of the Paribhâshâs) says therefore:

**P. XVIII: Sometimes (it) also (happens that only) a part (of the words of a rule which are mutually connected) is valid (in a subsequent rule, while the rest ceases to be valid).**

Kaiyaṭa on P. V., 2, 25[1] explains (the word एकयोगनिर्दिष्टयोः) to mean, 'of two (words) which in a rule stand in such a connection as to convey one meaning' *i. e.* 'of two (words) of a rule that form a Dvandva-compound and denote (on that account several things so) combined as to be regarded as one.'—All that (we learn from Paribh. XVII. and XVIII.) results from the circumstance that exactly so much (as is meant to be valid in a subsequent rule) is (by the authorities on grammar) agreed upon to be *svarita*.[2]

---

1. Bhâshya on P. V., 2, 25: पक्षात्तिः । मूल इति वक्तव्यम् । पक्षस्य मूलं पक्षतिः । तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । मूल इति वर्तते । क्व प्रकृतम् । तस्य पाकमूले पील्वादिकर्णादिभ्यः कुणब्जाहचौ [५. २. २४] इति । यदि तदनुवर्तते पाकेऽपि प्राप्नोति । मूल इत्यनुवर्तते पाक इति निवृत्तम् । कथं पुनरेकयोगनिर्दिष्टानामेकदेशो वर्तते । एकयोगनिर्दिष्टानामप्येकदेशानुवृत्तिर्भवति । तद्यथा संख्याव्ययादेर्ङीप् [४. १. २६] दामहायनान्ताच्च [२७] संख्यादेरित्यनुवर्तते ऽव्ययादेरिति निवृत्तम् ॥

Kaiyaṭa: एकस्मिन्नर्थे योगः संबन्धस्तेन निर्दिष्टयोः समुदायाभिधायिद्वन्द्वनिर्दिष्टयोरित्यर्थः ॥ द्वन्द्वस्य तदर्थस्य चैकत्वादेकदेशानुवृत्तिर्न संभवतीति भावः । एकसूत्रनिर्दिष्टानां त्वेकदेशानुवृत्तिर्दृश्यते ॥ एकयोगनिर्दिष्टानामपीति । अर्थाधिकारपक्षेऽर्थस्यैकत्वाद्विच्छेदाभावान्नास्त्येकदेशानुवृत्तिः । शब्दाधिकारपक्षे तु यस्यैव शब्दस्य स्वरितत्वं प्रतिज्ञातं तत्सदृशशब्दान्तरसंनिधानं योगोत्तरे प्रतीयत इति दोषाभावः ॥

P. Nâgojîbhaṭṭa thinks, that according to Kaiyaṭa एकयोगनिर्दिष्ट means 'forming a Dvandva-compound', and he quotes Kaiyaṭa in order to indicate that he himself prefers another explanation. In reality, however, Nâgojîbhaṭṭa misunderstands Kaiyaṭa; the latter wishes to say that sometimes even in the case of words that form a compound only one of the words compounded is valid in a subsequent rule, and that this must therefore be much more the case when words are not compounded.

2. Where the latter Paribhâshâ is applied in the Bhâshya, the Pûrvapakshin tries to prevent its application by stating that of several words of a rule which are mutually connected one only cannot be valid in

This (Paribhâshâ) and also the preceding one are found in the Bhâshya on P. IV., 1, 27, on P. VI., 1, 93[1] (and in the Bhâshya on P. V., 2. 25.)

---

a subsequent rule. The Pûrvapakshin in these cases attaches the main importance to the sense of the words which are mutually connected, and he thinks that as their sense is one and inseparable, one word only cannot be valid in the sequel. But the Siddhântin attaches the main importance to the words, and he considers that the word or words, which is or are *svarita*, is or are valid in a subsequent rule; one word may be made *svarita* while another is not *svarita*; sometimes one word may be *svarita* up to a certain rule, and another word may be *svarita* up to another rule. By a different assumption of *svaritatva* the limits of the *Anuvritti* become different; by assuming *svaritatva* of one part only, only this one part becomes valid; by assuming *svaritatva* of several words together, all these words become valid up to the same limit.—Sîradeva says that Paribhâshâ XVIII. is indicated by the word इति in P. I., 1, 67, because the repetition of this word shows that of the two words इति निर्दिष्टे in P. I.. 1, 66 only the one word निर्दिष्टे is valid in I., 1, 66; another scholar maintains that it is indicated by गुणवृद्धी in P. I., 1, 3 which would be superfluous if P. I., 1, 1 and 2 were both valid. Both these views are refuted by the above. P.

1. The Bhâshya on P. IV., 1, 27 contains almost nothing but what is said in the Bhâshya on P. V., 2, 25; see above.—Bhâshya on P. VI., 1, 93:

ननु चोक्तम् । ओतस्तिङि प्रतिषेध इति । सुबधिकारात्सिद्धम् । सुपीति प्रकृतं वर्तते । क्व प्रकृतम् । वा सुप्यापिशलेः [६. १. ९२] इति । यद्यनुवर्तत इहापि विभाषा प्राप्नोति । सुब्ग्रहणमनुवर्तते वाग्रहणं निवृत्तम् । कथं पुनरेकयोगनिर्दिष्टयोरेकदेशोऽनुवर्तेत एकदेशो न । एकयोगे चैकदेशानुवृत्तिरन्यत्रापि नावश्यमिहैव । एकयोगनिर्दिष्टानामप्येकदेशानुवृत्तिर्भवति । अन्यत्रापि नावश्यमिहैव । क्वान्यत्र । अङ्गाधिकारः प्रागानङ उत्तरपदाधिकारः प्रागङ्गाधिकारात् ॥.—Paribhâshâ XVII. is not actually read in any of the three passages of the Bhâshya quoted above.

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XIX.

(P. VII., 2, 102 teaches that before case-terminations अ is substituted for the final of त्यद् etc. Considering that अ denotes by P. I., 1, 69 अणुदित्सवर्णस्य च etc. also all letters homogeneous with अ, and therefore also the nasalized अ, and that according to P. I., 1, 50 out of a number of possible substitutes that only ought to be substituted which bears the closest proximity to the original), one might say that, when P. VII., 2, 102 is applied (to इदम्) *e. g.* in (the formation of) the Acc. Sing. Masc. (इमम्),[1] the nasalized (अ ought to be substituted for the final म् of इदम्, and that the penultimate अ of इमम् ought therefore to be a nasalized अ). To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says :

**P. XIX : (A letter) which is taught (in a rule) does not denote (the letters) homogeneous with it.**[2]

The[3] word अप्रत्ययः in P. I., 1, 69 debars (a letter from denoting also those letters), which it (otherwise) would denote,[4] (firstly)

---

1. इमम् is formed thus: इदम् + अम्, by P. VII., 2, 102 इद अ + अम्; by P. VI., 1, 97 इद् अ + अम्; by P. VI., 1, 107 इद् अ + म्; by P. VII., 2, 109 इम् अ + म् *i. e.* इमम्; the अ of इमम् stands therefore in the place of the original म् of इदम्.

2. The unnasalized अ, the substitution of which is taught in P. VII., 2, 102, cannot therefore denote nasal अ, although the latter is homogeneous with the former; and nasalized अ can consequently not by P. VII., 2, 102 be substituted for the final of इदम्.

3. Hereby Nâgojîbhaṭṭa shows that this Paribhâshâ does not teach anything new but is established by the meaning of P. I., 1, 69.

4. P. : ननु केन प्राप्तं तन्निषिध्यत इति चेत् । तत्रादौ व्यक्तिपक्ष आह सूत्रेति । जातिपक्ष आह जातीति । व्यक्तिपक्ष एवानण्साधारण्येनाह गुणेति ।; *e. g.* ई which is not contained in the Pratyâhâra अण्, and which therefore cannot by P. I.,

in accordance with (the words अणुदित्सवर्णस्य च of) the same rule, (secondly), as representative of all the letters of its own class, and (thirdly) on the ground that (mere difference of) quality does not constitute any difference (of letters; and) by the force[1]

---

1, 69 denote both the *anunâsika* and the *niranunâsika* ई, nor the *udâtta* and *anudâtta* ई, would denote all these letters by Paribhâshâ CIX.

1. सामर्थ्यात्; P.: ननु प्रत्यये निषेधेऽपि तेनादेशादौ कथं निषेधः । अत आह सामर्थ्यादिति ।....तथा चादेशादौ विधा प्राप्तं तत् (*viz.* सवर्णग्रहणं) तत्सूत्रस्थाप्रत्यय इति निषेधेन न सामर्थ्यादित्यर्थः । अप्रत्यय इत्येतत्सामर्थ्यादिति पाठस्तु सुगम एव ॥ Cf. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 69 (Ed. Ballantyne pag. 758): अणुदित्सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः । अप्रत्यय इति किमर्थम् । सनाशंसभिक्ष उः [३. २. १६८] अ सांप्रतिके [४. ३. ९] । अल्पमिदमुच्यते ऽप्रत्यय इति । अप्रत्ययादेशटिकिन्मित इति वक्तव्यम् । प्रत्यय उदाहृतः । आदेश इदम इश् [५. ३. ३] इतः इह । टिति लविता लवितुम् । किति बभूव । मिति हे अनड्वन् ॥ टितः परिहारः । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति न टिता सवर्णानां ग्रहणं भवतीति यदयं ग्रहोऽलिटि दीर्घत्वं शास्ति [७. २. ३७] । नैतदस्ति ज्ञापकं नियमार्थमेतत्स्यात् । ग्रहोऽलिटि दीर्घ एवेति । यच्चायं वृतो वा [७.२.३८] इति विभाषां शास्ति ॥ सर्वेषामेष परिहारो भाव्यमानेन सवर्णानां ग्रहणं नेत्येवं न भविष्यति । प्रत्यये भूयान्परिहारः । अनभिधानात्प्रत्ययः सवर्णान्न ग्रहीष्यति । यान्हि प्रत्ययः सवर्णान्गृह्णीयान्न तैरर्थस्याभिधानं स्यात् । अनभिधानान्न भविष्यति ॥ इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम् । इह केचित्प्रतीयन्ते केचित्प्रत्याय्यन्ते । ह्रस्वाः प्रतीयन्ते दीर्घाः प्रत्याय्यन्ते । यावद्ब्रूयात्प्रत्याय्यमानेन सवर्णानां ग्रहणं नेति तावदप्रत्यय इति । किं पुनर्दीर्घः सवर्णग्रहणेन गृह्णीयात् । ह्रस्वम् । यत्नाधिक्यान्न भविष्यति । प्लुतं तर्हि गृह्णीयात् । अनण्त्वान्न ग्रहीष्यति ॥ एवं तर्हि सिद्धे सति यदप्रत्यय इति प्रतिषेधं शास्ति तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यो भवत्येषा परिभाषा भाव्यमानेन सवर्णानां ग्रहणं नेति ॥

Extract from Kaiyaṭa:

अप्रत्यय इति किमर्थमिति । किं यस्य प्रत्ययसंज्ञा विहिता तस्य प्रतिषेध उत यः प्रतीयते विधीयत इति यौगिकप्रत्ययस्तस्यापीति प्रश्नः ॥........प्रत्यये भूयानिति । साधारणश्चासाधारणश्चेत्यर्थः । प्रत्यय इत्यन्वर्थसंज्ञा कृता येनार्थं प्रतियन्ति स प्रत्ययो न च दीर्घप्लुतयोरर्थस्याभिधानमस्ति ॥ ह्रस्वा इति । प्रतीयन्ते श्रूयन्त उच्चार्यन्तेऽणादिचोदनास्वित्यर्थः ॥

1. Ed. यावद्ब्रूते.

which it possesses (in P. I., 1, 69, अप्रत्ययः has this debarring power not merely in regard to letters that are affixes, but also in regard to letters which are substitutes or augments). The same is the purport (of this Paribhâshâ. The author of the Bhâshya) on P. I., 1, 69, after having previously proved in a different manner[1] that (a letter which is) an affix, or a substitute, or an augment, cannot denote the letters homogeneous with it, (says) therefore: 'Because then (everything that was supposed to be accomplished by अप्रत्ययः) is thus attained (without अप्रत्ययः, Pâṇini's) object in

---

दीर्घौ इति । ह्रस्वैर्गृहीतैरगृह्ला[दीर्घाणां] ग्रहणात् । अटन आ विभक्तौ[७.२.८४]इत्यत्राकारो ग्राहको मा भूदित्यर्थः। यथैव अण्त्वादाकारो रपरत्वादिकार्यं प्रतिपद्यते तथा ग्राहकत्वमपि प्रतिपद्येतेति भावः । कथं पुनरप्रत्यय इत्यस्याभाव्यमान इत्यर्थः । अन्तर्भावितण्यर्थादेतेः कर्मण्यच्विधानात् ||........भाव्यमानेनेति । प्रतीयते विधीयत इति यौगिकत्वात् प्रत्ययस्य ग्रहणमिति भावः ||

अप्रत्ययः is unnecessary both when प्रत्यय has the technical meaning of 'affix,' and when it conveys the sense of प्रत्याय्यमान; it must therefore convey the same meaning which is conveyed by the present Paribhâshâ, and that it may be able to do so, the meaning of प्रतीयमान, *i. e.* विधीयमान, भाव्यमान is ascribed to the word प्रत्यय by Kaiyaṭa.

1. *Viz.* by the present Paribhâshâ which is necessary both when P. I., 1, 69 is rejected and when it is retained; in the former case, in order to prevent letters from denoting also the letters homogeneous with them, which they would denote जातिपक्षे, and गुणाभेदकत्वेन; in the latter case, in order to prevent at least substitutes, and augments that have the Anubandha क् or म् from denoting letters homogeneous with them. As to augments that have the Anubandha ट्, there exists a Jnâpaka which indicates that they cannot denote homogeneous letters; and a letter which is an affix cannot denote the letters homogeneous with it because the latter would not convey the meaning of the affix.

making the prohibition अप्रत्ययः can be no other than to indicate[1] the existence of the Paribhâshâ "a letter—homogeneous with it." Moreover[2] the fact that (Pâṇini in the term आत् of) VI., 4, 160 employs the long (vowel आ) indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ; for without this Paribhâshâ the actual enunciation of long आ would have been superfluous) because the (substitution of) *long* (आ for the ई of ईयस्) would (by P. I., 1, 50) have resulted from the (prosodial) proximity (of these two vowels, even) if (Pâṇini) had merely said ज्याद ईयसः. This (Paribhâshâ) is found in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 69 and on P. VI., 4, 160.[3]—In P. VIII., 2, 30 etc. (the letters क् etc.) which are taught

1. ज्ञापयतीति ; P.: एकदेशानुमतिद्वारोक्तपरिभाषां बोधयतीत्यर्थः । एवं चैतदर्थबोधकत्वेनैव तस्य सार्थक्यमिति नान्यत्वेनात्र ज्ञापकत्वमिति भावः ।. (Cf. Nâgojî. on P. I., 1, 69. Ed. pag. 760). अप्रत्ययः indicates the existence of this Paribhâshâ by admitting one part of it *viz.* by admitting the Paribhâshâ in cases where the letter taught is an affix. (Cf. the different opinion of Kaiyaṭa pag. 107.) अप्रत्ययः differs from other Jnâpakas in this that it conveys the sense which is expressed by this Paribhâshâ, but does not become *charitârtha* after having established its existence. Cf. Paribh. I., pag. 2, note 3.

2. This is added because the rule P. I., 1, 69 and therewith the above-mentioned Jnâpaka अप्रत्ययः of the present Paribhâshâ might possibly be altogether rejected. If this Paribhâshâ did not exist, it would have been sufficient to say ज्याद ईयसः, because in that case अ would have denoted also all homogeneous letters, and of all these possible letters only आ could on account of its prosodial proximity to ई have been substituted for this vowel,

3. Cf. Bhâshya on P. VI., 4, 160 : अथ किमर्थं ज्यादादीयसो दीर्घ उच्यते नाकार एवोच्येत । का रूपसिद्धिः । ज्यायान् । आन्तर्यतो दीर्घस्य दीर्घो भविष्यति । एवं तर्हि सिद्धे सति यद्दीर्घग्रहणं करोति तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यो भवत्येषा परिभाषा भाव्यमानेनेति ॥

(in those rules) do nevertheless denote the letters homogeneous with them, because the Anubandha उ has been attached to them; (for उ would have been superfluous if कु etc. had not been meant to denote also the letters homogeneous with them). With a view to this,[1] modern (grammarians) adopt the following reading (of the above Paribhâshâ): 'a letter that is contained in the Pratyâhâra अण् does, when it is taught (in a rule), not denote the letters homogeneous with it.'[2]

1. एतदेव i. e. अनण्युदिति तत्सामर्थ्यमेव. P.

2. Notwithstanding that Paribhâshâ XIX. can only refer to such letters as are contained in the Pratyâhâra अण्, the above reading of modern grammarians should not be adopted because it does not occur in the Bhâshya. P.

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XX.

Now one might say that in accordance (with the preceding Paribhâshâ the vowel उ *e. g.* in P. VIII., 2, 80 ought to denote only short उ, but that, if such were really the case,) a rule like P. VIII., 2, 80 could not enjoin (the substitution of) long (ऊ for a long vowel like औ etc.) *e. g.* in (the formation of) the Nom. Du. Masc. of अदस् (*i. e.* अमू)[1]. To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

**P. XX: The letter उ denotes, even when it is taught (in a rule, also) the letters homogeneous with it.[2]**

1. According to P. it has been shown elsewhere that it is wrong to regard the उ of P. VIII., 2, 80 with Bhaṭṭojî. Si. Kau. I., p. 180, as a Samâhâra-dvandva of उ+ऊ.

2. Accordingly उ in P. VIII., 2, 80 denotes also ऊ, and only the latter can by P. I., 1, 50 be substituted for the original औ.

The addition of (the letter) त् (to उ) in P. VI., 1, 131[1] and 111 indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ; for त् has been added in order to show that the उ of both rules is meant to denote only short उ. If this Paribhâshâ did not exist, the addition of त् would have been superfluous, because in that case उ could by the preceding Paribhâshâ have denoted only short उ). This (Paribhâshâ) is found in the Bhâshya on P. VI., 1, 185.[2]

---

1. If the term क्ङिति of P. VI., 4, 15 is no longer valid in P. VI., 4, 19, ऊ must by the latter rule be substituted for the व् of दिव् *e. g.* in the Instr. Plur. For this ऊ short उ is subsequently substituted by P. VI., 1, 131. But if the term क्ङिति of P. VI., 4, 15 *is* valid in P. VI., 4, 19, ऊ cannot by the latter rule be substituted for the व् of दिव्, but उ has to be substituted by P. VI., 1, 131. Considering that on the latter alternative the addition of त् to उ in VI., 1, 131 cannot suggest the existence of this Paribhâshâ, Nâgojîbhaṭṭa adds another Jnâpaka *viz.* the addition of त् to उ in P. VI., 1, 111. The त् which is added to उ in the latter rule, prevents, after it has indicated the existence of this Paribhâshâ, the substitution of long ऊ for the two vowels ऋ + अ.

2. Cf. Bhâshya on P. VI., 1, 185:

तित्स्वरितम् । तिति प्रत्ययग्रहणम् । तिति प्रत्ययग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । इह मा भूत् । ऋत इद्धातोः [ ७. १. १०० ] किरति गिरति । तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । नैष तकारः । कस्तर्हि । दकारः । यदि दकार आन्तर्यतो दीर्घः प्राप्नोति । भाव्यमानेन सवर्णानां ग्रहणं नेत्येवं न भविष्यति । यदि भाव्यमानेन सवर्णानां ग्रहणं नेत्युच्यते अदसोऽसेर्दादु दो मः [ ८. २. ८० ] अमूभ्यामित्यत्र न प्राप्नोति । एवं तर्ह्याचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति भवत्युकारेण भाव्यमानेन सवर्णानां ग्रहणमिति यदयं दिव उदित्युकारं तपरं करोति ॥ एवमर्थमेव तर्हि प्रत्ययग्रहणं कर्तव्यमत्र मा भूदिति । नैष तकारः । कस्तर्हि । दकारः । यदि दकारो न ज्ञापकं भवति । एवं तर्हि तपरस्तत्कालस्य [ १. १. ७० ] इति दकारोऽपि चर्त्वभूतो निर्दिश्यते । यद्येवं चर्त्वस्यासिद्धत्वाद्धशि च [ ६. १. ११४ ] इत्युत्त्वं प्राप्नोति । सौत्रो निर्देशः । अथवासंहितया निर्देशः करिष्यते । अणुदित्सवर्णस्य चाप्रत्ययः तपरस्तत्कालस्येति ॥

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXI.

(In forms like गवे, अव् has been substituted by P. VI., 1, 78 for the ओ of गो before the affix ए). Now one might say that, in (forming a compound like) गोहितम् etc.[1] of गवे हितम् etc. (where लुक् is substituted for the affix ए by P. II., 4, 71), the substitutes अव् etc. ought to have taken the place (of ओ etc.) in accordance with P. I., 1, 62, (by which an operation dependent on an affix should take place even after the disappearance of the affix). To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says :

**P. XXI: (An operation) which is caused by an affix, does (in case the latter should disappear) not take place, if it depends on the letter or letters (of the affix and not on the affix as such).[2]**

This (Paribhâshâ) concerns (operations) where the main importance attaches to letters (*i. e.* operations which are caused by letters as such and not by affixes as such).[3] And that it applies really only in such cases[4] is established by the circumstance that, whereas (the purport of P. I., 1, 62) would have been accomplished, (without the employment of the word प्रत्ययलक्षणम्), by making the word स्थानिवत् of P. I., 1 56 valid in P. I., 1, 62, प्रत्ययलक्षणम् has been employed (in I., 1, 62), in order (to show) that P. I., 1, 62 applies only to those (operations) in which the

1. The आदि 'etc.' includes *e. g.* रायः कुळम् रैकुळम्, where आय् ought to have been substituted for ऐ.

2. वर्णाश्रये is a Bahuvrîhi compound; *scil.* विधौ कार्ये.

3. वर्णप्राधान्याश्रयकविधिप्रवृत्तिविषयमिदं वचनमित्यर्थः. P.

4. तत्त्वं च; वर्णप्राधान्याश्रयकविधौ कार्येऽप्रत्ययलक्षणत्वं चेत्यर्थः. P.

main importance attaches to the affixes (*i. e.* to those operations which depend on affixes as such). By 'main importance of the affix' we mean 'its not qualifying anything else.'

The main importance of letters, on the other hand, appears in two forms, *viz.* either they do not qualify anything else, or they are qualified by an affix.[1] Accordingly अव् etc. have not been (substituted for ओ etc.) in गोहितम् etc. (*viz.* because the ए, included in the Pratyâhâra अच् of P. VI., 1, 78, which causes the substitution of अव् etc., does not qualify anything else); and in (the formation of) चित्रा 'born under the Nakshatra Chitrâ' the affix ङीप् has not by P. IV., 1, 15 been added to चित्र (the affix अण् of which has disappeared by the substitution of लुक्), because P. IV., 1, 15 teaches that ङीप् is added to a crude form ending in अ, when this letter अ is the affix अण्, (and because therefore अ which would have caused the addition of ङीप् is qualified here by the affix).[2]

Although[3] (by P. I., 1, 56) a substitute does not cause the operations which the original would have caused, provided they

---

1. प्रत्ययनिरूपित०, *i. e.* प्रत्ययनिष्ठप्रकारतानिरूपित°. P.

2. अण् ought by P. IV., 3, 16 to be added to चित्रा; for this अण् लुक् is substituted by the Vârttika चित्रारेवती० on P. IV., 3, 34; moreover by P. I., 2, 49 लुक् is further substituted for the Femin. affix टाप् of चित्रा, and we obtain thus चित्र. Here ङीप् ought, although अण् has disappeared, in the Feminine to be added by P. IV., 1, 15; but this is prevented by the present Paribhâshâ.

3. Now one might say that, P. I., 1, 62 being in the opinion of the Bhâshyakâra a restrictive rule (*viz.* a rule which teaches that on the disappearance of an affix only those operations shall take place which are caused by something which can be nothing else but an affix), operations dependent on the letters of the affix cannot by P. I., 1, 62

would have been caused by letters of the original (and although the present Paribhâshâ would therefore appear to be superfluous, it has nevertheless been given) in order to debar the operations dependent on an affix, which would have taken effect in accordance with P. I., 1, 62, when namely this rule is considered as a rule that teaches something (new, and is not regarded as a restriction of something that was known previously).[1] This is found in the Bhâshya (on P. I., 1, 62).

---

take effect when the affix has disappeared, and that consequently this Paribhâshâ is useless. Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says therefore 'although......' अल्विधौ *i. e.* यथाकथंचिदल्विधौ. P. See below.

1. This Paribhâshâ is therefore necessary when the opinion of the Vârttikakâra is adopted, that P. I., 1, 62 is (not a *Niyama* but) a *Vidhi* concerning operations which are caused by letters, ( तथा चाल्विधौ विध्यर्थं तत्सूत्रमिति वार्त्तिकमतेनेयं न भाष्यमतेनेति भाव: P.) and which, had P. I., 1, 62 not been given, would have been forbidden by the restriction अनल्विधौ of P. I., 1, 56, *e. g.* such operations as the addition of इम् in अतृणेट् taught in P. VII., 3, 92.

Extract from the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 62. Ed. Ballantyne pag. 703 :

अथ द्वितीयं प्रत्ययग्रहणं किमर्थम् । प्रत्ययलक्षणं यथा स्याद्वर्णलक्षणं मा भूदिति । गवे हितं गोहितम् । रायः कुलं रैकुलमिति ॥

किमर्थं पुनरिदमुच्यते । प्रत्ययलोपे प्रत्ययलक्षणवचनं सदन्वाख्यानाच्छास्त्रस्य । प्रत्ययलोपे प्रत्ययलक्षणमित्युच्यते सदन्वाख्यानाच्छास्त्रस्य । सच्छास्त्रेणान्वाख्यायते । सतो वा शास्त्रमन्वाख्यायकं भवति । सदन्वाख्यानाच्छास्त्रस्य । उगिदचां सर्वनामस्थानेऽधातोः [ ७. १. ७० ] इतीहैव स्यात् । गोमन्तौ यवमन्तौ । गोमान्यवमानित्यत्र न स्यात् । इष्यते च स्यादिति । तच्चान्तरेण यत्नं न सिध्यति । अतः प्रत्ययलोपे प्रत्ययलक्षणवचनमित्येवमर्थमिदमुच्यते ॥......

न तर्हीदानीमयं योगो वक्तव्यः । वक्तव्यश्च । किं प्रयोजनम् । प्रत्ययं गृहीत्वा यदुच्यते तत्प्रत्ययलक्षणेन यथा स्याच्छब्दं गृहीत्वा यदुच्यते तत्प्रत्ययलक्षणेन मा भूदिति । किं प्रयोजनम् । शोभना दृषदोऽस्य सुदृषद्ब्राह्मणः सौमनसी अलोमोषसी [ ६. २. ११७ ] इत्येष स्वरो मा भूदिति ॥

Kaiyaṭa: वर्णलक्षणमिति । प्रत्ययलोपे तल्लक्षणमित्युच्यमाने प्रत्ययस्य यत्र कार्ये निमित्तभावः प्रत्ययत्वरूपाश्रयेण वर्णरूपाश्रयेण वा तत्सर्वं स्यात्सर्वनाम्नो वस्तुमात्रपरामर्शित्वात् । प्रत्ययग्रहणे तु सति प्रत्ययनिमित्तमेव कार्यं प्रत्ययलोपेऽपि भवति न वर्णरूपतानिमित्तम् ॥ रैकुलमिति । अवयवद्वारेणात्र प्रत्ययस्याप्यायादेशं प्रति निमित्तत्वमस्त्येव प्रत्ययाश्रयत्वाायादेशो न भवतीति न प्रवर्तते ॥......

किमर्थमिति । स्थानिवद्भावेन सिद्धमिति भावः ॥ ...... न च स्थानिवद्भावेन सिध्यत्यतृणेडित्यादावल्विधित्वात् ॥......

प्रत्ययं गृहीत्वेति । स्थानिवद्भावेन सिद्धे सत्ययं योगो नियमार्थः । प्रत्यय एव यस्य लक्षणं तत्प्रत्ययलोपे यथा स्यात् । सौमनसी इत्यत्र त्वननिस्मन्ग्रहणानि चेति वचनादस् प्रत्ययश्चाप्रत्ययश्च गृह्यत इति सुदृषदित्यत्र स्थानिवद्भावाभावादुत्तरपदाद्युदात्तत्वाभावे नञ्सुभ्याम् [ ६. २. १७२ ] इत्यन्तोदात्तत्वं भवति । तत्र चोत्तरपदादिरित्यधिकारादसन्तमुत्तरपदं गृह्यत इति सुदृषदित्यत्रापि स्थानिवद्भावादसन्तत्वमुत्तरपदस्य स्यात् ॥

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXII.

(P. VIII., 3, 46 teaches that स् shall be substituted for the final Visarjanîya of words ending in अः, that are not indeclinables, when they are compounded with following कृ, कम्, कंस, कुम्भ etc.; *e. g.* अयः + कारः = अयस्कारः). Now one might say that the word कंस in this rule is superfluous, because (the substitution of स् before कंस, *e. g.* in अयः + कंसः) results (already) from the employment in P. VIII., 3, 46 of (the root) कम् (from which कंस is derived; for when a root is exhibited in a rule in the Locative

case, it denotes every word that begins with it). To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

P. XXII: Those (words) which end (or are supposed to end) with (the affixes) उण् etc. are crude forms that do not undergo (or cause) such operations as would depend on their etymological formation (or, they do not admit of a division into base and affix).[1]

This very (employment of कंस in P. VIII., 3, 46) indicates, according to Kaiyaṭa and others (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ. Nor can one object that this is impossible because कंस is not derived from the root कम् but from कंस्; for) कंस is not derived from कंस् because (a derivative of the latter root) would not express (the meaning of कंस. This Paribhâshâ) is found in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 61[2] etc. From the

1. उणादयः । तदन्तानि तदन्तत्वेनाभिमतानि वा । अव्युत्पन्नानीत्यस्यार्थे व्युत्पत्तिकार्याभाववन्तीत्यर्थः । अन्ये तु यथाश्रुत एव ।. P.—If कंस had not been given in P. VIII., 3, 46, स् could not by this rule have been substituted for the Visarga of अयः in अयः + कंसः, because the substitution of स् would have depended solely on the etymological formation of कंस, *viz.* on the fact of its being derived from कम्.

2. There it has been stated that, if the word प्रत्ययस्य had not been employed in P. I., 1, 61, one ought in P. IV., 3, 168 कंसीयपरशव्ययोः... to have read ञयतोः, in order to prevent the substitution of लुक् for the bases of the two words. Further it has been remarked that in that case लुक् ought to be substituted also for the affixes स and उ of कंस and परशु, but this objection has been refuted by means of the present Paribhâshâ.—The आदि 'etc.' includes P. VII., 1, 2 etc.

Bhâshya on P. III., 1, 133[1] (we see) that (crude forms which end with the affixes उण् etc.) also do undergo (or cause) such operations as depend on their etymological formation; this is in accordance with the view of S'âkaṭâyana and others. Pâṇini, on the other hand, adopts, as has been shown in the S'abdendus'ekhara[2] only the alternative that (the Uṇâdi words) have no

---

1. Cf. Bhâshya on P. III., 1, 133: विशेषणार्थस्तर्हि [चकारः of तृच्] । क्व विशेषणार्थेनार्थः । अप्तृन्तृच् इति । तृ इत्युच्यमाने मातरौ मातर इत्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति ॥
Kaiyaṭa: मातराविति । उणादिषु तृप्रत्ययान्ता मात्रादयो निपातिता इति भावः ॥
The च् of तृच् is said to serve the purpose of distinguishing this affix from the तृ of मातृ 'mother' etc.; if Pâṇini instead of saying तृच् had in III., 1, 133, and consequently also in VI., 4, 11, said तृ, one ought by the latter rule to have formed मातारौ etc., just as one forms कर्तारौ etc. from कर्तृ. This shows that the word मातृ which ends with an Uṇâdi-affix, has here been regarded as *vyutpanna*, for otherwise P. VI., 4, 11 could not have been applied to it.—But, adds Pâyaguṇḍa, this is no Siddhânta, and therefore Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says इदं (*i. e.* व्युत्पन्नानीत्युक्तं) शाकटायनादिरीत्या; the word आदि 'etc'. includes the Nairuktas.

2. शब्देन्दुशेखरे; P. उणादय इत्यत्र । उणादय इति व्याकरणान्तरस्थसूत्रव्यवस्थापकम् । उणाद्यन्ता येन व्याकरणान्तरेण व्युत्पादिताः शब्दास्तत्र बहुलमिति वक्तव्यं वर्तमानाधिकारे च ते वाच्या भूतेऽपीति च वाच्यमिति सूत्रार्थः । स्वशास्त्रे तेषां साधुत्वबोधनं चैतावतैव कृतम् । सर्पिषा यजुषेत्यादौ षत्वं तु बहुलग्रहणादेवेत्यादि तत्रैव स्पष्टम् ॥ On P. III., 3, 1. There the following remarks are made: The Sûtra उणादयो बहुलम् establishes something concerning certain rules that are found in other grammars; its meaning is this: 'whatever other grammars assign etymologies to the words ending (or supposed to end) with (the affixes) उण् etc., they have (concerning these words) to say "बहुलम्" and they have to treat of them under the heading वर्तमाने, and they have also to say "भूतेऽपि." In his own grammar Pâṇini mentions the existence of those words herewith only. The substitution of ष् for स् in सर्पिषा, यजुषा etc. (for which there would seem to be no authority

etymology. This[1] very point has been clearly stated in the Bhâshya on P. VII., 1, 2.[2]

---

if the final स् of सर्पिस् and यजुस् etc. do not form part of the affixes) results only from the word बहुलम् etc. See P. VIII., 3, 59.

1. एतत् *i. e.* अस्याव्युत्पत्तिपक्ष एवेत्येतत्. P.

2. There, in order to prevent the substitution of इन् etc. for ख् etc. in शङ्ख etc., it has been said: प्रातिपदिकाविज्ञानाच्च पाणिनेः सिद्धम् । प्रातिपदिकविज्ञानाच्च भगवतः पाणिनेराचार्यस्य सिद्धम् । उणादयोऽव्युत्पन्नानि प्रातिपदिकानि ॥.

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXIII.

One might say that in phrases like देवदत्तश्चिकीर्षति 'Devadatta wishes to do' (the combination of letters) which begins with देव (and ends with the Desid. affix सन्, *i. e.* देवदत्तश्चिकीर्ष,) ought on account of its ending with the Desid. affix सन् (by P. III., 1, 32) to be termed 'a root' etc.[1] To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

**P. XXIII: An affix denotes, whenever it is employed (in grammar, a word-form) which begins with that to which that (affix) has been added and ends with (the affix) itself.[2]**

(This Paribhâshâ is proved thus): The portion यस्मात्प्रत्ययवि-

---

1. If देवदत्तश्चिकीर्ष were termed 'a root,' लुक् ought by P. II., 4, 71 to be substituted for the termination स् of देवदत्तस्.

2. The affix सन् in P. III., 1, 32 denotes therefore only चिकीर्ष which begins with कृ to which सन् has been added and ends with सन्, but it does not denote देवदत्तश्चिकीर्ष, and the latter can consequently not be called a root by P. III., 1, 32.

धिस्तदादि प्रत्यये of P. I., 4, 13 is taken as a separate sentence, (and to complete it) the words गृह्यमाण उपतिष्ठते are supplied. (The meaning of this sentence is this that 'whenever an affix is employed, it denotes something which begins with that to which the affix has been added'). Hereby that part (of the Paribhâshâ) which ends with तदादेः is established. The part तदन्तस्य, on the other hand, is established by P. I., 1, 72. And this (rule P. I., 1, 72 applies here) in such a manner as to make ('ending with the affix') qualify a word-form (as such and as one undivided whole), because there is nothing else that could be qualified by it; (सनन्त 'ending with सन्' qualifies therefore चिकीर्ष as a whole, and does not qualify it as a combination of कृ + स). It is incorrect to say that, because an affix postulates a combination consisting of (the affix) itself and of a base, P. I., 1, 72 applies here so as to make 'ending with the affix' qualify that (combination of the affix itself and of a base); for in (forms like) इयान् etc.[1] (where the base has totally disappeared) there can exist no postulation between the affix and such a combination (of the affix and a base), because (such a combination) does not exist.[2]

---

1. व्यतिस इयानित्यादौ is according to Pâyagunda a wrong reading because the form व्यतिसे (from rt. अस् 'to be' with prep. व्यति, cf. P. VI., 4, 111, VII., 4, 50) is not in use; (see also Paribh. XXX.). The आदि 'etc.' includes इः in the sense of अस्यापत्यम् 'the descendant of A' (cf. P. IV., 1, 95). इयत् is formed from इदम् by the following rules: इदम् + वतु by P. V., 2, 40 इदम् + घतु; VII., 1, 2 इदम् + इयत्; VI., 3, 90 ई + इयत्; VI., 4, 148 इयत्.

2. P. proposes a second explanation of the words तस्य तादृशसमुदायेन व्यभिचारेण, *viz.* तस्य । श्रूयमाणप्रत्ययस्य । समुदायेन । सहेति शेषः । व्यभिचारे च द्वयोः साहित्यम् ।; 'because the affix (itself, if it is said always to postu-

Where[1] an affix is made the cause (of an operation) there only that portion (of the Paribhâshâ) which ends with तदादेः is applicable, (*i. e.* there the affix denotes the affix by itself and the operation affects that to which the affix is added[2]); this may be seen in the Bhâshya and in Kaiyaṭa's commentary on P. VI., 4, 1.[3] In the same manner the

late a combination of a base and of the affix itself,) ceases to exist together with that combination (*i. e.* ceases to exist when that combination ceases to exist).'

1. *E. g.* in P. VII., 4, 13 केऽणः, or P. VI., 4, 71 लुङ्लङ्लृङ्क्ष्वडुदात्तः.—The present Paribhâshâ does not concern an affix when it is being taught in a rule, but it refers only to an affix that has been taught elsewhere, when it is mentioned in a rule which teaches something else than this affix.

2. That to which the affix is added stands here in the Genitive case.

3. Cf. Bhâshya on P. VI., 4, 1: अथवा प्रत्यय इति प्रकृत्याङ्गकार्यमध्येष्ये। यदि प्रत्यय इति प्रकृत्याङ्गकार्यमधीषे प्राकरोत् उपैहिष्ट उपसर्गात्पूर्वमडाटौ प्राप्नुतः। सिद्धं तु प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स विहितस्तदादितदन्तविज्ञानात्। सिद्धमेतत्। कथम्। प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स विहितस्तदादेस्तदन्तस्य ग्रहणं भवतीति। एवमुपसर्गात्पूर्वमडाटौ न भविष्यतः॥

Kaiyaṭa: सिद्धं त्विति। यत्र प्रत्ययो निमित्तत्वेनोपादीयते तत्र पूर्वः कार्यित्वेन गृह्यमाणो यस्मात्स विहितस्तदादिर्गृह्यते। एतच्चाङ्गसूत्रे योगविभागेन साधितम्। यत्र तु प्रत्यय एव कार्यित्वेनोपादीयते तत्र तदन्तग्रहणमिति द्वे एते परिभाषे॥

Pâyaguṇḍa, in order to show that the application of the portion तदन्तस्य of this Paribhâshâ to लुङ्लङ्लृङ्क्षु of P. VI., 4, 71, and to के of P. VII., 4, 13, etc. is in reality prevented by Paribhâshâ XXIV., explains Kaiyaṭa's remark thus: उपस्थितपूर्वस्येत्यस्यैतावधित्वेनान्वयादपञ्चम्या इति निषेधेन तदन्तविधिर्नेति तदाद्यन्तांशमात्रोपस्थितिरिति स एव कार्यीति न तत्राडादीति कैयटः—He further says that the chief result of Nâgojîbhaṭṭa's statement regarding an affix which is made the cause of an operation, is this that P. VI., 3, 46 conveys the meaning that 'before the affix जातीय आ is sub-

portion ending with तदादेः is likewise applicable, where[1] an affix which follows upon a word in the Ablative case (*i. e.* which is qualified by a word in the Ablative case) is (somehow or other) made (the cause of an operation[2]) ; but here (that to which the affix is added) is denoted by that which stands in the Ablative case; (*i. e.* the affix denotes likewise merely itself; that which is expressed by the word in the Ablative case qualifies that to which the affix is added ; and the latter in its turn, being so qualified, qualifies the affix). We therefore derive from P. VI., 1, 69 (where संबुद्धेः follows upon the Ablative एङ्-ह्रस्वात्) the meaning that '(Lopa is substituted for a consonant belonging to the Vocative affix when this affix) follows upon (that to which the Vocative affix is added), provided that the latter ends with एङ् (etc.).'[3]

Another reason why this Paribhâshâ should be adopted has been mentioned in the Bhâshya[4] on P. I., 1, 72, (*viz.* this,

---

stituted for (the final of) that to which जातीय is added if it ends with महत्' and that consequently आ is by P. VI., 3, 46 substituted for the त् of अतिमहत् in the formation of अतिमहाजातीय.

1. *E. g.* in P. VI., 1, 69 एङ्ह्रस्वात्संबुद्धेः or P. VIII., 2, 42 रदाभ्यां निष्ठातो नः पूर्वस्य च दः.

2. आश्रीयत इति; यथाकथंचिन्निमित्तत्वेनेत्यादिः. P.

3. But where an affix is given as that which undergoes the operation taught in a rule, there the whole Paribhâshâ applies to it, as *e. g.* in the case of वतु, डति etc. in P. I., 1, 23 etc. To indicate this Nâgojîbhaṭṭa continues with अस्याः *scil.* समुदितायाः etc. P.

4. *Viz.* by means of the Vârttika प्रत्ययग्रहणं चापञ्चम्याः; the sense of this Vârttika is: 'the rule येन विधिस्तदन्तस्य applies to affixes, except where an affix, which has been taught somewhere else, is given in a rule, for the sake of teaching some other operation than the addition of this affix itself, after a word in the Ablative case (*i. e.* so as to be qualified by a word in the Ablative case).' Cf. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72:

that we can account by it for the formation of words like) परमगार्ग्यायण 'a descendant of Paramagârgya.' Here the affix (फक् of P. IV., 1, 101) has been added to the word गार्ग्य only, (and) not to the whole (परमगार्ग्य), notwithstanding that (परमगार्ग्यायण) is dissolved into परमगार्ग्यस्यापत्यम् 'a descendant of Paramagârgya'; (but this addition of फक् to गार्ग्य only is justified by the present Paribhâshâ according to which only the word गार्ग्य *i. e.* गर्ग + यञ् can be denoted by the affix यञ् in P. IV., 1, 101). Although (in परमगार्ग्य + फक्) the meaning (of the affix फक्) does not unite itself with the meaning of the separate word (गार्ग्य) alone, (but unites itself with the meaning of the whole परमगार्ग्य,) nevertheless the Taddhita-affix फक् is here undoubtedly added (to the separate word गार्ग्य alone). That the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72 authorises this, has been fully explained elsewhere.[1]

The present (Paribhâshâ) applies, as appears from the Bhâ-

---

प्रत्ययग्रहणं चापञ्चम्याः प्रयोजनम्। यञिञोः फग्भवति। गार्ग्यायणः वात्स्यायनः परमगार्ग्यायणः परमवात्स्यायनः। अपञ्चम्या इति किमर्थम्। दृषत्तीर्णो परिषत्तीर्णो॥

Kaiyaṭa: ............ परमगार्ग्यायण इति। अत्र गार्ग्यायण इत्येवोदाहरणं गार्ग्यशब्दाद्यञन्तात्फग्विधानात्। न त्वत्र परमगार्ग्यशब्दात्प्रत्ययस्तस्य यञन्तत्वाभावात्॥

One might object that, as ङ्याप्प्रातिपदिकात् of P. IV., 1, 1 is valid in P. IV., 1, 101 यञिञोश्च, the affixes यञ् and इञ् stand after (*i. e.* are qualified by) a word in the Ablative case, and that therefore the Tadantavidhi ought on account of the exception अपञ्चम्याः not to apply to यञ् and इञ्. But this is wrong, because the Ablative ङ्याप्प्रातिपदिकात् does not qualify यञिञोः, but is qualified by यञिञोः which, although it is a Genitive, has the meaning of an Ablative case; for P. IV., 1, 101 has to be explained यञन्तात्प्रातिपदिकात् etc. P.

1. *Viz.* in the Uddyota.

shya[1] on P. IV., 1, 6, wherever any term is employed which cannot denote anything but an affix, but it does not apply where a term is employed which may denote both an affix and also something else. It is found in the Bhâshya on P. I., 4, 13.[2]

---

1. Cf. Bhâshya on P. IV., 1, 6. ........ उभयथा निर्गोमती निर्यवमतीति न सिध्यति । किं कारणम् । प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवतीति । नैतत्प्रत्ययग्रहणं प्रत्ययाप्रत्यययोरेतद्ग्रहणम् । कथम् । वर्णोऽप्युगित् । प्रत्ययोऽप्युगित् । प्रातिपदिकमप्युगित् ।

उगित् 'that to which one of the letters contained in the Pratyâhâra उक् is attached as Anubandha,' does not denote merely affixes, but also letters etc.; consequently the present Paribhâshâ does not apply to it, and निर्गोमत् (*i. e.* गोमतो निष्क्रान्तः) may therefore just like गोमत् be considered as ending with the *ugit* affix मतुप् and receive the affix ङीप् in the Feminine, although the *ugit* affix has not been added to निर्गो but has been added to गो only.

2. There the Paribhâshâ is made use of to show that the rule P. I., 4, 13 is unnecessary. P. remarks that, as it is an Ekades'in (*i. e.* one who is only imperfectly acquainted with the true state of the matter) who tries to refute P. VI., 4, 1 by means of this Paribhâshâ, so he who tries to reject P. I., 4, 13 by means of it, must likewise be an Ekades'in.

---

Extract from the Bhâshya on P. 1, 4, 13 :[1]

तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् । न वक्तव्यम् । कथमिदानीमङ्गकार्यं भविष्यति । प्रत्यय इति प्रकृत्याङ्गकार्यमध्येष्ये ।यदि प्रत्यय इति प्रकृत्याङ्गकार्यमधीषे प्राकरोत् उपैहिष्ट उपसर्गात्पूर्वमडाटौ प्राप्नुतः ।सिद्धं तु प्रत्ययग्रहणे य-

---

1. Kaiyata: अवयवान्विचार्य सूत्रमाक्षेप्तुं प्रश्नं करोति । तत्तर्हीति । सूत्रमित्यर्थः ।। प्रत्यय इति प्रकृत्येति । तेन ब्राह्मणभिस्सा क्रिमिणा पश्येत्यादावैस्दीर्घाद्यभावः ।। प्राकरोदिति । लङि परतः पूर्वस्यानियतावधेरडागमो विधीयमान उपसर्गादेः स्यात् ।। सिद्धं त्विति । यत्र

स्मात्स तदादेस्तदन्तविज्ञानात् । सिद्धमेतत् । कथम् । प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स विहितस्तदादेस्तदन्तस्य ग्रहणं भवतीत्येषा परिभाषा कर्तव्या । कः पुनरत्र विशेषः । एषा परिभाषा क्रियते **प्रत्ययग्रहणं वा** । **अवश्यमेषा** परिभाषा कर्तव्या । **बहून्यस्याः** परिभाषायाः प्रयोजनानि । प्रयोजनं धातुप्रातिपदिकप्रत्ययसमासतद्धितविधिस्वराः ॥ धातु । देवदत्तश्चिकीर्षति । **संघातस्य** धातुसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति । धातु ॥ प्रातिपदिक । देवदत्तो गार्ग्यः । संघातस्य प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति । प्रातिपदिक ॥ प्रत्यय । **महान्तं** पुत्रमिच्छति । संघातात्प्रत्ययोत्पत्तिः प्रसज्येत । प्रत्यय ॥ समास । **ऋद्धस्य** राज्ञः पुरुषः । संघातस्य समाससंज्ञा प्राप्नोति ॥ तद्धितविधि । देवदत्तो गार्ग्यायणः । **संघातात्तद्धितोत्पत्तिः** प्राप्नोति । तद्धित ॥ स्वर । देवदत्तो गार्ग्यः । संघातस्य ञ्नित्यादिर्नित्यमित्याद्युदात्तत्वं प्राप्नोति ॥ प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स तदादेस्तदन्तस्य ग्रहणं भवतीति न दोषो भवति ॥ सा तर्ह्येषा परिभाषा कर्तव्या । न कर्तव्या । **एवं वक्ष्यामि** । यस्मात्प्रत्ययविधिस्तदादि प्रत्यये गृह्यमाणे गृह्यते । ततोऽङ्गम् । अङ्गसंज्ञं च भवति यस्मात्प्रत्ययविधिस्तदादि प्रत्यये ॥ यदि प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवतीत्युच्यते ऽवतप्तेनकुलस्थितं त एतत् उदकेविशीर्णं त एतत् सगतिकेन

---

पूर्वः कार्यित्वेनाश्रीयते तत्र तदादेः कार्यं भवति यत्र तु प्रत्ययान्तसंघात आश्रीयते तत्र तदादिप्रत्ययान्तस्य ग्रहणं भवतीत्यर्थः ॥ प्रत्ययग्रहणं वेति । प्रत्ययो गृह्यते यस्मिन्सूत्रे तदङ्गसंज्ञासूत्रमित्यर्थः ॥ अवश्यमिति । क्रियमाणेऽप्यस्मिन्सूत्रे परिभाषावश्यं कर्तव्येति व्यापित्वात्परिभाषैवाश्रयणीया न तु सूत्रमित्यर्थः ॥ संघातस्येति । ततश्च सुब्लुक् प्राप्नोति ॥ महान्तं पुत्रमिति । समुदायस्यान्ते सुप्श्रवणात्सुबन्तत्वात् । सत्यां तु परिभाषायां समुदायस्यासुबन्तत्वादवयवस्य सापेक्षत्वादसामर्थ्यान्न भवति प्रत्ययः ॥ ऋद्धस्येति । सुप्सुपेति विवक्षितायामपि संख्यायां समुदायस्य सुबन्तत्वात्समासप्रसङ्गः । परिभाषायां तु सत्यां समुदायस्यासुबन्तत्वात्सुबन्तसमुदायस्य च संख्याविवक्षायां समासाप्रसङ्गादवयवस्य च सापेक्षत्वात्समासाभावः ॥ संघातात्तद्धितोत्पत्तिरिति । ततश्च वृद्धिस्वरौ संघातस्य स्यातां पूर्वस्य च सुपो लुक् ॥ एवं वक्ष्यामीति । योगविभागोऽत्र क्रियते । यस्मात्प्रत्ययविधिस्तदादि प्रत्यय इत्येकं सूत्रम् । अत्र

सनकुलेन च समासो न प्राप्नोति । एवं तर्हि प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवतीत्युक्त्वा ततो वक्ष्यामि कृद्ग्रहणे गतिकारकपूर्वस्यापि । कृद्ग्रहणे गतिकारकपूर्वस्यापि ग्रहणं भवतीत्येषा परिभाषा कर्तव्या । कान्येतस्याः परिभाषायाः प्रयोजनानि । प्रयोजनं समासतद्धितविधिस्वरः ॥ समास । अवतप्तेनकुलस्थितं त एतत् उदकेविशीर्णं त एतत् सगतिकेन सनकुलेन च समाससिद्धिर्भवति । समास ॥ तद्धितविधि । सांकूटिनं व्यावक्रोशी संघातात्तद्धितोत्पत्तिः सिद्धा भवति । तद्धितविधि ॥ स्वर । दूरात् आगतो दूरादागतः । अन्तः [ ६. २. १४३ ] थाथघञ्क्ताजबित्रकाणाम् [ १४४ ] इत्येष स्वरः सिद्धो भवति । कृद्ग्रहणे गतिकारकपूर्वस्यापि ग्रहणं भवतीति न दोषो भवति ॥ सा तर्ह्येषा परिभाषा कर्तव्या । न कर्तव्या । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयति भवत्येषा परिभाषेति यदयं गतिरनन्तरः [ ६. २. ४९ ] इत्यनन्तरग्रहणं करोति ॥

---

सोपस्कारत्वात्सूत्राणां गृह्यमाणे गृह्यत इति वाक्यशेषः समर्थ्यते । प्रत्यये गृह्यमाणे यस्मात्प्रत्ययविधिस्तदादि गृह्यत इत्यर्थः ॥ सांकूटिनमिति । अण्णिनुणः [ ५. ४. १५ ] इति यदि कूटिन्नित्येतस्मादण् स्यात्तदा तस्यैवादिवृद्धिः स्यात् ॥ दूरादागत इति । आगम्यते स्मेति कर्मणि क्तः । तत्र गतिस्वरेणाद्युदात्त आगतशब्दः । ततो दूरशब्दस्य स्तोकान्तिक [ २. १. ३९ ] इति समासः । पञ्चम्याः स्तोकादिभ्यः [ ६. ३. २ ] इत्यलुक् । अत्र समासान्तोदात्तत्वे प्राप्ते तदपवादकृत्स्वरेणाद्युदात्त आगतशब्दे प्राप्ते सगतेरपि क्तान्तत्वात्स्थानान्तरप्राप्तत्वाद्गतिस्वरस्य बाधकस्यापि बाधकत्वात्थाथघञ्क्तेति सिद्धमन्तोदात्तत्वम् ॥ यदयमिति । अनन्तरग्रहणप्रयोजनमभ्युद्धृतमित्यत्राभिशब्दस्य व्यवहितस्य प्रकृतिस्वरो मा भूदिति । यदि चैषा परिभाषा न स्यात्तत उद्धृतशब्दस्याक्तान्तत्वात्क्तान्त उत्तरपदेऽनन्तरे परतो गतिस्वरो विधीयमानो नैव प्राप्नोति किमनन्तरग्रहणेन तत्क्रियमाणमस्याः परिभाषायाः सद्भावं ज्ञापयतीत्यर्थः ॥

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXIV.

In the Bhâshya on the rule P. I., 1, 72 we read[1] the (following) exception regarding the portion तदन्तस्य of the preceding (Paribhâshâ):

**P. XXIV: And where an affix is employed after a word in the Ablative case, (there it does) not (denote a word-form ending with the affix).**

The meaning[2] is this that, where an affix which follows upon (or, in other words, is qualified by) a word in the Ablative case, is made use of[3] (in a rule) for the sake of teaching some

---

1. In the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72 we read really प्रत्ययग्रहणं चापञ्चम्याः, but this has the same sense as Paribhâshâ XXIV. See note 4 on page 120.

2. One might say that by the (प्रत्यासत्तिन्याय, *i. e.* the) maxim of association (*viz.* because the word 'affix' suggests the idea that 'the word in the Ablative case' ought likewise to be an affix) this Paribhâshâ conveys the meaning, that the portion तदन्तस्य of the preceding Paribhâshâ is not valid where an affix is taught after an affix that is given in the Ablative case; and one might say that this is not contained already in the Vârttika समासप्रत्ययविधौ प्रतिषेधः (Si. Kau. I., p. 23), because this Vârttika limits only the rule येन विधिस्तदन्तस्य and does not limit the preceding Paribhâshâ. But such an explanation of the present Paribhâshâ must be rejected, because according to it the affix अञ् taught in P. IV., 3, 155 would have to be added to a ञित् affix only (not to that which ends with a ञित् affix), and if this were done in the case of *e. g.* औष्ट्रक (*i. e.* उष्ट्र + वुञ्, see P. IV., 3, 157), the affix वुञ् would have to be called 'Anga' and would receive Vṛiddhi and the accent accordingly. In order to indicate this Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says: 'The meaning is this....' P.

3. परिगृह्यते *i. e.* अनूद्यते; therefore the Paribhâshâ does not concern affixes that are being taught in a rule.

other operation[1] (than the addition of this very affix), there it does not denote a word-form ending with the affix; an instance is afforded (by the affix निष्ठा) in P. VIII., 2, 42. In दृषत्तीर्णा (from दृषद्+तीर्-ता) etc. न्, (changeable to ण्), has accordingly (by P. VIII., 2, 42 been substituted for the त् of the affix त only, and it has not) been substituted for the letter त् of the root (तॄ, and for the द् preceding it). That portion (of the preceding Paribhâshâ) which ends with तदादेः being applicable (in P. VIII., 2, 42), although the portion तदन्तस्य is not applicable, the meaning (of P. VIII., 2, 42) is this, that '(न् is substituted) for the त् of the affix त when it follows upon that (to which the affix त is added), provided that (that to which त is added) ends with र् or द्, (*e. g.* when त is added to तीर्)'; consequently there is nothing incorrect (in दृषत्तीर्णा), just because there is no authority for applying the portion तदन्तस्य (of the preceding Paribhâshâ). But if the part तदन्तस्य were (likewise) applicable, both (तदादेः and तदन्तस्य) would refer to one and the same (word-form तीर्+त), and (तीर्णा) in दृषत्तीर्णा etc. would then certainly be incorrect.[2] The meaning (of ऌलुटोः) in P. III., 1, 33 etc.[3] is, 'when ऌ (*i. e.* ऌट् and ऌङ्) and लुट् follow upon'; this being the case, (ऌ and लुट्) require that some specific term should be supplied which should denote that upon which ऌ and लुट् follow; they therefore unite with the word धातोः 'upon a root'

---

1. Such as the substitution of something or the addition of another affix.

2. The meaning of P. VIII., 2, 42 would in this case be: रदाभ्यां परो यस्तदादिर्निष्ठान्तस्तस्य तकारस्य तत्पूर्वदस्य च नत्वम्, and न् being accordingly substituted for the radical त् of तॄ (by P. I., 1, 54) and for the final द् of दृषद्, the result would be दृषन्नीर्ता.

3. The आदि 'etc.' includes P. VII., 3, 102 सुपि च; VIII. 3, 16 रोः सुपि etc.

which is supplied (from P. III., 1, 22) as denoting that upon which they follow, and (being thus preceded or qualified by a word in the Ablative case), they do (according to this Paribhâshâ) not denote word-forms ending with (ल and लुट्, but denote the affixes ल and लुट् by themselves. When,) on the other hand, (the affixes ङी and आप्) in P. VI., 1, 68 etc.[1] (do denote word-forms ending with ङी and आप् ), this is not contrary (to the present Paribhâshâ); for here (the affixes ङी and आप्) do not require[2] us to supply any specific term which should denote that upon which ङी and आप् follow; there is consequently no word in the Ablative case to qualify (ङी and आप्, and the Paribhâshâ does therefore not concern these affixes). But in P. I., 4, 13 where (the word प्रत्यये) conveys the meaning 'तदादेः[3] प्रत्यये परे when the affix follows upon that which begins with that to which it is added,' the 'affix' is clearly qualified by a word in the Ablative case (*viz.* by तदादेः, and it denotes therefore only the affix by itself and does not denote a word-form ending with the affix). It is for this reason[4] that such words as उत्तमैकाभ्याम् which occur in P. V., 4, 90 etc. are formed in accordance (with the present Paribhâshâ).

---

1. P. explains इत्यादौ by इत्याद्यंशे; the Paribhâshâ does not apply to the portion ङ्याप् of P. VI., 1, 68, but it does apply to सुतिसि. The following तत्र he explains accordingly by ङ्यापंशे.

2. Because the word परे which in P. III., 1, 33 does require us to supply the Ablative धातोः, is here wanting.

3. तदादेरिति । प्राग्वदुपस्थिततदादीत्यस्यैवावधित्वेनान्वय इति भावः ॥. P.

4. *I. e.* because प्रत्यये in P. I., 4, 13 is qualified by a word in the Ablative case, and because consequently the present Paribhâshâ applies to प्रत्यये and makes the latter denote merely an affix and not a word-form ending with an affix. Were प्रत्यये to denote a word-form ending with an affix, उत्तमैक would not be termed Anga and its final अ would not be lengthened by P. VII., 3, 102.

### PARIBHÂSHÂ XXV.

Now one might say that (if) then (Paribh. XXIII. were limited only by Paribh. XXIV., affixes like ष्य in P. VI., 3, 43 ought by Paribh. XXIII. to denote word-forms like ब्राह्मणिष्य that end with ष्य; and such being the case,) in (the formation of a compound e. g. of) कुमारी + ब्राह्मणिष्या[1] short (इ) ought by P. VI., 3, 43 to be substituted (for the ई of कुमारी. The author of the Paribhâshâs) says therefore:

**P. XXV: An affix, when employed (in a rule) in which the word उत्तरपदे is valid (*i. e.* in a rule of P. VI., 3, 1), does not denote a word-form ending with the affix.[2]**

(The affix ष्य in P. VI., 3, 43 denotes accordingly only this affix by itself, and does not denote words like ब्राह्मणिष्य. Such is the case) because (Pâṇini) employs the word लेख in VI., 3, 50; (for, if this Paribhâshâ did not exist, the affix अण् in P. VI., 3, 50 would denote all word-forms ending with अण्, including लेख which is formed with the affix अण्, and the separate mention of लेख would be superfluous. The fact that लेख has

1. The phrase कुमारी ब्राह्मणिष्या is merely given in order to suggest the formation of a compound in which both members are co-ordinate; the compound, when formed, would really be कुमारब्राह्मणिष्या. The rule P. VI., 3, 35 by which ब्राह्मणी ought to become ब्राह्मण before ष्य, is superseded by P. VI., 3, 43 in accordance with which ब्राह्मणिष्या is formed; before that, कुमारी becomes कुमार by P. VI., 3, 42.

2. But the portion तदादेः of Paribhâshâ XXIII. does apply where it is of any use, and does not apply where it is of no use; *e. g.* it does not apply in P. VI., 3, 43, but it applies in regard to the affix जातीय of VI., 3, 46; see pag. 119, note 3. P.

been mentioned separately shows, that अण् in P. VI., 3, 50 does not denote word-forms ending with अण्, and indicates thus the existence of this Paribhâshâ). The word लेख in P. VI., 3, 50 does not end with (the affix) घञ्, because (this affix) would not express the requisite meaning.[1] The (Paribhâshâ) is found in the Bhâshya on the very rule P. VI., 3, 50.[2]

---

1. लेख must have been formed by means of the affix अण् because it is made in the Bhâshya the Jnâpaka of this Paribhâshâ; if लेख did not end with अण्, it could not have indicated the existence of the Paribhâshâ.

2. P.: This Paribhâshâ applies only to those affixes in P. VI., 3, that are made causes of certain operations, when they are qualified by something else (*e. g.* अण् in P. VI., 3, 50, the meaning of which is अणि परे), and are employed in their individual forms (such as अण्, रूप etc., and not by means of such general terms as कृत्, or खित् etc.). They must be causes of an operation and qualified by something else, because they have to resemble in these respects the Adhikâra उत्तरपदे, and they must be given in their individual forms because such is the case with the affix अण् in the Jnâpaka-rule P. VI., 3, 50. Accordingly, the Paribhâshâ does not apply to ङी of P. VI., 3, 43; 61; ङ्याप् of 63; खित् of 66; ञ of 71; कृत् of 72; बप्रत्यय of 92; क्वि of 116.—घञ् in 122, to which the Paribhâshâ should apply, we are forced by the meaning of the rule to explain by घञन्त.—तद्धित in 62 does not mean तद्धितान्त, (although the Paribh. does not apply to it), because the च after तद्धिते shows that उत्तरपदे is taken separately and is not qualified by तद्धिते; we can therefore not explain तद्धितान्त उत्तरपदे but must explain तद्धिते चोत्तरपदे च.

Cf. Bhâshya on P. VI., 3, 50. यदण्ग्रहणमिदं प्रत्ययग्रहणमिदम् । प्रत्ययग्रहणम् । तत्र प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स विहितस्तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवतीति यदणन्ते प्राप्नोति । यदण्ग्रहणे रूपग्रहणं लेखग्रहणात् । यदण्ग्रहणे रूपग्रहणं द्रष्टव्यम् । कुतः । लेखग्रहणात् । यदयं लेखग्रहणं करोति तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यो न यदणन्ते भवतीति ।। अपर आह । अत्यल्पमिदं ज्ञाप्यते । सर्वत्रैवोत्तरपदाधिकारे प्रत्ययग्रहणे रूपग्रहणं द्रष्टव्यम् । कुतः । लेखग्रहणात् । किं प्रयोजनम् । कुमारि गौरितरा । घादिषु नद्या ह्रस्वो भवतीति ह्रस्वत्वं प्रसज्येत ।।

Kaiyaṭa: ...... ळेखग्रहणादिति । एतद्वचनान्यथानुपपत्त्या च ळेखशब्दोऽन्ती गृह्यते न तु घञन्त इति घञि हृदयल्लेख इत्येव भवति ॥ सर्वत्रैवेति । प्रकरणापेक्षं ज्ञापकमाश्रीयते न त्वेतद्योगापेक्षमेवेत्यर्थः ॥ कुमारी गौरितरेति । उदाहरणदिग्यियं समासस्तूदाहार्यः कुमारगौरितरेति ॥..........

---

## Paribhâshâ XXVI.

Now one might say that, (even when Paribhâshâ XXIII. has) thus (been limited by Paribh. XXIV. and XXV., Samprasâraṇa) ought by P. VI., 1, 13 to have been (substituted for य.) in अतिकारीषगन्ध्यापुत्रः 'the son of a woman who surpasses Kârîshagandhyâ,' just as (it has been substituted) in परमकारीषगन्धीपुत्रः 'the son of the excellent Kârîshagandhyâ.'[1] To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

P. XXVI: A feminine affix (denotes, whenever it is employed in a rule, a word-form which ends with that affix, but which need) not (necessarily begin with that to which the affix has been added); but where (the word-form which the feminine affix would denote by Paribhâshâ XXIII.) is subordinate (to the feminine which the affix would denote if that portion of Pari-

---

1. *I. e.* if that portion of Paribhâshâ XXIII. which ends with तदादेः did apply to ष्यङ् in P. VI., 1, 13, Samprasâraṇa ought not to be substituted in परमकारीषगन्ध्या; and if it did not apply, Samprasâraṇa ought to be substituted also in अतिकारीषगन्ध्या.

bhâshâ XXIII. which ends with तदादेः were rejected, there the feminine affix denotes in accordance with Paribhâshâ XXIII. a word-form which both ends with that feminine affix and begins with that to which the affix has been added).

(As ष्यङ्[1] has been added to करीषगन्धि, it would by Paribhâshâ XXIII. denote only the feminine कारीषगन्ध्या ; according to this Paribhâshâ, however, it denotes also the feminine परमकारीषगन्ध्या, because here कारीषगन्ध्या is not subordinate to the whole परमकारीषगन्ध्या. In अतिकारीषगन्ध्या, on the other hand, कारीषगन्ध्या *is* subordinate to the whole feminine अतिकारीषगन्ध्या, for the meaning of the latter is कारीषगन्ध्यामतिक्रान्ता स्त्री 'a woman that surpasses K.;' accordingly ष्यङ् denotes in this case only कारीषगन्ध्या, and not also अतिकारीषगन्ध्या, and P. VI., 1, 13 is therefore not applicable to the latter. One may then by Pâṇini's rule form परमकारीषगन्धीपुत्रः, but not अतिकारीषगन्धीपुत्रः). The Locative (अनुपसर्जने) denotes the limits (within which the portion ending with तदादेः of Paribh. XXIII. is not applicable to a feminine affix.) The meaning (of the Paribhâshâ) is this, that the restriction contained in that portion of Paribh. XXIII. which ends with तदादेः, does not[2] concern a feminine affix wherever the feminine noun (which this affix would denote in accordance with Paribh.

---

1. ष्यङ् is a substitute for अण् and इञ् in the feminine (cf. P. IV., 1, 78 etc.); after ष्यङ् has been substituted, the Prâtipadika receives the affix चाप् by P. IV., 1, 74.

2. But the portion तदन्तस्य of Paribhâshâ XXIII. does apply to the feminine affix.

XXIII.) is not subordinate (to the meaning of the feminine noun which it would denote without that restriction); but that that restriction certainly does concern a feminine affix, wherever the feminine noun (which the affix would denote by Paribh. XXIII.,) is subordinate (to the meaning of the feminine noun which the affix would denote without the restriction तदादेः of Paribh. XXIII.). By (the maxim of) association this Paribhâshâ can only apply when (the meaning of the feminine noun which according to Paribh. XXIII. would be denoted by the feminine affix), is not subordinate to the meaning of the whole feminine noun which would be regarded as ending with the feminine affix, (if the restriction तदादेः did not exist). Consequently (the word स्त्री 'feminine affix' in P. I., 2, 48 denotes not merely the word कुमारि, but it denotes also *e. g.* राजकुमारि, and) short (इ) is (therefore by P. I., 2, 48) substituted (for the long ई of the latter) in (the formation of) अतिराजकुमारिः etc.; for here the restriction तदादेः does not apply (to स्त्री) because, although the word राजकुमारि is subordinate to the meaning of the word अति, (कुमारि) is not subordinate to the meaning of राजकुमारि.[1] The term उपसर्जन 'subordinate' has therefore in this Paribhâshâ not the technical meaning (which has been assigned to it in Pâṇini's grammar), because this would be impossible.[2] As this

---

1. In अतिराजकुमारि, राजकुमारी is *upasarjana* by P. I., 2, 44, but कुमारी is not *upasarjana*, in the sense in which this word is used in this Paribhâshâ, in regard to राजकुमारी.

2. असंभवात् explains the meaning of the preceding अत एव; 'this would be impossible,' because the *Upasarjanatva* of the feminine affix in this Paribhâshâ which results from the maxim of प्रत्यासत्ति, differs from the *Upasarjanatva* taught in P. I., 2, 43 and 44.

(Paribhâshâ) is an exception[1] to Paribh. XXIII. and forms one sentence with that (Paribhâshâ), the word ग्रहणे, 'when it is employed,' unites itself (also with this Paribhâshâ), and (the Paribhâshâ) applies therefore where a feminine affix is employed by means of some general designation[2] and also where some special[3] feminine affix is employed, but it does not apply where a term is employed which may denote both a feminine affix and also something else than a feminine affix.[4] This is suggested in the

1. According to the maxim उत्सर्गसमानदेशा अपवादाः; as this maxim is not always valid, Nâgojîbhaṭṭa adds तदेकवाक्यता° *i. e.* वाक्यैकवाक्यता°. The meaning of the Paribhâshâ is therefore: गृह्यमाणे स्त्रीप्रत्यये सत्यनुपसर्जनविषये तदादिनियमो नान्यत्तु तत्रैवास्त्येव. P.

2. Such as स्त्री in P. I., 2, 48.

3. Such as ष्यङ् in P. VI., 1, 13.

4. One of the interpretations of P. I., 2, 64 is सरूपसमुदायाद्विहितायामेकाविभक्तौ परत एकशेषः 'Ekas'esha takes place when one case-termination is enjoined after a combination of uniform words,' *e. g.* भिक्षा भिक्षा भिक्षा आम्=भिक्षाणाम्. If the present Paribhâshâ did apply here, the whole combination भिक्षा भिक्षा भिक्षा would be आबन्त *i. e.* it would end with an affix, and it would consequently on account of the exception अप्रत्ययः in P. I., 2, 45 not be termed a Prâtipadika; further the termination आम् could not be added to it, and, there being no termination, the Ekas'esha could not take place. But Kaiyaṭa remarks on P. I., 2, 64 that the termination आम् *is* added to भिक्षा भिक्षा भिक्षा, and that in the formation of भैक्ष (*i. e.* भिक्षा भिक्षा भिक्षा आम् + अ) it is dropped (in accordance with the Paribhâshâ सर्वविधिभ्यो लुग्विधिर्बलीयान्) before any other operation takes place. This shows that the present Paribhâshâ does not apply here, the reason being, that आप् is not exclusively a feminine affix. Cf. Kaiyaṭa on P. I., 2, 64. भिक्षा भिक्षा भिक्षा आम् अ इति स्थिते सर्वविधिभ्यो लुग्विधेर्बलीयस्त्वे लुकि कृते विभक्त्यभावादेकविभक्तौ परतो विधीयमान एकशेषो न प्राप्नोति प्रत्ययलक्षणं च नास्ति न लुमताङ्गस्येति प्रतिषेधात् ॥.

Bhâshya on P. I., 2, 46.[1] The (Paribhâshâ) is found in the Bhâshya on P. VI., 1, 13 where it is given as an independent rule.[2]

---

1. *Viz.* by the circumstance that the word समास has been said to convey the restriction (नियम) that of all combinations of words that possess a meaning only a compound is called *Prâtipadika.* Cf. Bhairavamis'ra: यदि स्त्रीप्रत्ययास्त्रीप्रत्ययेऽप्येषा परिभाषा प्रवर्तेत तदा राजकुमारीति समुदायस्यानया प्रत्ययान्तत्वेन प्रत्ययान्तपर्युदासस्य (cf. P. I., 2, 45) प्राप्त्या समासग्रहणस्य तत्र प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञाविधायकत्वेन चारितार्थ्यसंभवेन नियमार्थत्वकथनविरोध इति तेन ध्वनितमित्यर्थः ॥

2. *I. e.*, it is neither founded on a Nyâya nor established by a Jnâpaka.

Cf. Bhâshya on P. VI., 1, 13. इहापि तर्हि न प्राप्नोति । कारीषगन्धीपुत्रः कारीषगन्धीपतिरिति । किं कारणम् । पूर्वपदमित्युच्यते । न ह्यत्र ष्यङ् पूर्वपदमस्ति । ष्यङन्तमेतत्पूर्वपदम् । कथम् । प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवतीति । यदि प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवतीत्युच्यते परमकारीषगन्धीपुत्रः परमकारीषगन्धीपतिरिति न सिध्यति । प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवत्यस्त्रीप्रत्ययेनेति । यद्यस्त्रीप्रत्ययेनेत्युच्यते अतिक्रान्तः कारीषगन्ध्यामतिकारीषगन्ध्यस्तस्य पुत्रो अतिकारीषगन्ध्यपुत्रो अतिकारीषगन्ध्यपतिरित्यत्रापि प्राप्नोति अस्त्रीप्रत्ययेनेत्युपसर्जने न । यो ह्युपसर्जनं स्त्रीप्रत्ययो भवत्येषा तत्र परिभाषा प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवतीति ॥

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXVII.

Now one might say that, (even when Paribhâshâ XXIII. has) thus (been limited by Paribhâshâs XXIV.—XXVI., affixes like तरप् and तमप् in P. I., 1, 22 ought in accordance with Paribh. XXIII. to denote word-forms ending with तरप् and तमप्, and such being the case, घ etc.) ought as a technical term by P. I., 1, 22 to denote word-forms ending with तरप् etc. (and ought not to denote merely the affixes तरप् etc.). To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

**P. XXVII: An affix, when employed in a rule which teaches the meaning of a technical term, does not denote a word-form ending with the affix.**

The employment of the word अन्त (in सुप्तिङन्त 'that which ends with 'Sup' or 'Tiṅ') in P. I., 4, 14 indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ; for, if the Paribhâshâ did not exist, अन्त would be superfluous, because सुप्तिङ् alone would in accordance with Paribh. XXIII. denote that which ends with 'Sup' or 'Tiṅ.') Nor is it correct to say that the term पद, even if it had (in P. I., 4, 14) been assigned to the affixes (सुप् and तिङ् alone), might in accordance with Paribh. XXIII. have denoted word-forms ending with पद (or, in other words, ending with सुप् and तिङ्),[1] and that (the word अन्त in P. I., 4, 14) would therefore remain useless[2] even after having indicated[3] (the existence of this Paribhâshâ); for as the term पद, wherever P. I., 4, 17 may be applicable, attaches to a base, it would not denote only an affix or affixes (and Paribh. XXIII. would therefore not be applicable to it.[4] The Paribhâshâ) is found in the Bhâshya on P. I., 4, 14.

---

1. *Scil.* प्रदेशेषु, in the rules in which पद is employed.

2. फलाभावः *i. e.* चारितार्थ्याभावः.

3. ज्ञापिते; *viz.* तत्र तदन्तविध्यभावे. *Scil.* 'and that अन्त ought therefore not to be regarded as Jnâpaka.'

4. पद would not denote word-forms ending with पद, or, in other words, ending with सुप् and तिङ्. See Paribh. XXII. pag. 122.

Bhâshya on P. I., 4, 14:[1]

सुप्तिङन्तं पदम् । अन्तग्रहणं किमर्थं न सुप्तिङ् पदमित्येवोच्येत । केनेदानीं तदन्तस्य भविष्यति । तदन्तविधिना । अत उत्तरं पठति । पदसंज्ञायामन्तग्रहणमन्यत्र संज्ञाविधौ प्रत्ययग्रहणे तदन्तविधिप्रतिषेधार्थम् । पदसंज्ञायामन्तग्रहणं क्रियते ज्ञापनार्थम् । किं ज्ञाप्यम् । एतज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्योऽन्यत्र संज्ञाविधौ प्रत्ययग्रहणे तदन्तविधिर्न भवतीति । किमेतस्य ज्ञापने प्रयोजनम् । तरप्तमपौ घः । तरप्तमबन्तस्य संज्ञा न भवतीति । किं च स्यात् । कुमारी गौरितरा । घादिषु नद्या ह्रस्वो भवतीति ह्रस्वत्वं प्रसज्येत । यद्येतज्ज्ञाप्यते सनाद्यन्ता धातवः [३.१.३२] इत्यन्तग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । कृत्तद्धितसमासाश्च [ १. २. ४६ ] अन्तग्रहणं कर्तव्यम् । इदं तृतीयमन्तग्रहणं ज्ञापकार्थम् । द्वे तावत्क्रियेते न्यास एव । यदप्युच्यते कृत्तद्धितसमासाश्चेत्यन्तग्रहणं कर्तव्यमिति न कर्तव्यम् ।

---

1. Kaiyaṭa: अन्तग्रहणमिति । असत्यन्तग्रहणे सुप्तिङामेव पदसंज्ञा स्यात्ततश्चाग्निञ्चित्यादौ सात्पदाद्योः [८. ३. १११] इति षत्वप्रतिषेधप्रसङ्ग इत्येतदर्थं यद्यन्तग्रहणं क्रियते तन्न कर्तव्यं प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स विहित इत्यनन्तरोक्तया परिभाषया तदन्तविधेर्लब्धत्वादिति प्रश्नः ॥ कुमारी गौरितरेति । तरबन्तस्य घसंज्ञायां सत्यां तत्रोत्तरपदे परतो ह्रस्वत्वं कुमारीशब्दस्य पुंवद्भावं परत्वाद्बाधित्वा स्यात्तरपि तु परतो गौरीशब्दस्य न स्यात्ततः कुमारिगौरतरेति प्राप्नोति कुमारगौरितरेति चेष्यते । भाष्ये तु समासप्रदर्शनपरवाक्यमुपात्तम् ॥ सनाद्यन्ता धातव इति । अन्यथा सनादीनामेव केवलानां धातुसंज्ञा स्यात्ततश्चाचिकीर्षदित्यत्र सन एव धातुत्वात्प्रत्ययोत्पत्तौ तदादेरेवाङ्गत्वात्सनः पूर्वोऽट् स्यात् ॥ कृत्तद्धितेत्यत्रासत्यन्तग्रहणे केवलयोः कृत्तद्धितयोः प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा स्यात्ततश्च भिद् छिदिति क्विबन्तस्य न स्यात् । अर्थवत्सूत्रेण तु न भवत्यधातुरिति निषेधात् । नापि प्रत्ययलक्षणेन प्राप्नोति प्रत्ययनिमित्तमन्यस्य यत्कार्यं विधीयते तत्प्रत्ययलोपे भवति न तु प्रत्ययस्यैव यत्कार्यं तदपि न असत्कार्यित्वेन वचनशतेनापि शक्यमाश्रयितुम् ॥ केवलस्य तद्धितस्य प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञायां सत्यामौपगव इत्यत्रापि षष्ठ्याः प्रातिपदिकेऽनन्तर्गतत्वाल्लुक् न स्यात् । तदन्त-

अर्थवदिति वर्तते । कृत्तद्धितान्तं चैवार्थवच्च केवलाः कृतस्तद्धिता वा ॥

---

विधौ तु दोषोऽनवतारः ॥ न केवला इति । ननु यद्यर्थवत्ता लौकिक्याश्रीयते सा पदस्यैव न कृत्तद्धितान्तस्यापि पदस्यैव लोके प्रयोगार्हत्वात् । अन्वयव्यतिरेकगम्या चार्थवत्ता केवलानामपि कृत्तद्धितानामस्तीति किमुच्यते न केवला इति । एवं तर्ह्यर्थवद्ग्रहणानुवृत्तिसामर्थ्याल्लौकिकार्थप्रत्यासन्नोऽभिव्यक्ततरो योऽर्थः प्रत्ययान्तेषु लभ्यते स आश्रीयत इत्यदोषः ॥

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXVIII.

(P. II., 1, 47 teaches that a noun in the Locative case may be compounded with क्त, provided that the compound so formed conveys a censure. According to Paribh. XXIII. the affix क्त would denote here a word-form like स्थित which begins with स्था to which क्त has been added and ends with the affix क्त, but it would not denote a word-form like नकुलस्थित because the latter does not begin with that to which क्त has been added, and) one might (therefore) say that the word नकुलस्थित on account of its not being क्तान्त (in the sense which this term would convey in accordance with Paribh. XXIII.) ought not (by P. II., 1, 47) to be compounded (with the Loc. अवतप्ते, or, in other words, that a compound) like अवतप्तेनकुलस्थित (ought not to be formed). To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

P. XXVIII: A Kṛit-affix denotes, whenever it is employed (in grammar, in accordance with Paribh. XXIII. a word-form which begins with that to which that Kṛit-affix has been added and which ends with the Kṛit-affix; but) moreover, (should a Gati, or a noun such as denotes

a case-relation, have been prefixed to that word-form which the Kṛit-affix would denote by Paribh. XXIII., then the Kṛit-affix must denote the same word-form) together with the Gati or the noun which may have been prefixed to it.[1]

The employment of the word अनन्तरः 'immediately preceding' in P. VI., 2, 49,—which rule conveys the meaning that 'a Gati retains (in a compound) its own accent, when it immediately precedes a second member that ends with क्त, provided the latter denotes the object (of the action which is expressed by the root to which क्त is added)'—indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ). For that (word अनन्तरः is employed) in order to guard against too wide an application (of P. VI., 2, 49, *viz.* the application of this rule to *e. g.* the Gati अभि) in the case of अभ्युद्धृत etc. (If the present Paribhâshâ did not exist, P. VI., 2, 49) would have no concern (with the Gati अभि of अभ्युद्धृत) simply because उद्धृत on account of Paribh. XXIII. would not be (regarded as) क्तान्त *i. e.* 'ending with क्त'; as therefore the employment of अनन्तरः would (otherwise) be useless, it must indicate (the existence of) the present (Paribhâshâ). Nor can one object

1. So long then as स्थित is used by itself, the Kṛit-affix क्त which is valid in P. II., 1, 47 will denote in accordance with Paribh. XXIII. only this word स्थित; but as soon as the Gati प्र or the noun नकुल has been prefixed to स्थित, the affix क्त can no longer denote the portion स्थित of प्रस्थित and नकुलस्थित, but it must denote the whole प्रस्थित and the whole नकुलस्थित, and the latter may therefore by P. II., 1, 47 be compounded with अवतप्ते.

that अभि in अभ्युद्धृत etc. must be anudâtta by P. VIII., 1, 70, (a rule which would supersede P. VI., 2, 49) because it follows upon the latter, (that the word अनन्तरः in P. VI., 2, 49, even suppose it were to indicate the existence of this Paribhâshâ, would consequently remain useless after having done so, and that it therefore cannot be regarded as the Jnâpaka of this Paribhâshâ); for that (rule P. VIII., 1, 70) has no concern (with the अभि of अभ्युद्धृत etc.) because (अभि) stands at the beginning of a Pâda, and because it does not follow upon a word.[1]

1. The words अनुदात्तं सर्वमपादादौ of P. VIII., 1, 18 are valid in VIII., 1, 70. Nâgojîbhatta adds पदात्परत्वाभावेन च because there is no proof for it that अभि stands at the beginning of a Pâda; by doing so he implies that the word पदात् of P. VIII., 1, 17 is valid in VIII., 1, 70. But Râghavendra observes correctly that this is wrong, because पदात् is valid only as far as P. VIII., 1, 69; (पदादित्यस्य कुत्सने च सुपि [ ८. १. ६९ ] इत्यतः प्रागेव निवृत्तेरयुक्तमेतत्). Kaiyaṭa says that the accentlessness of अभि etc. in अभ्युद्धृत etc. would result from P. VIII., 1, 70 and that Pâṇini's disregard of this rule together with the employment of the word अनन्तरः in VI., 2, 49 indicate the existence of the present Paribhâshâ. Cf. Bhâshya on P. VI., 2, 49:......एवं च कृत्वा नार्थोऽनन्तरग्रहणेन । कथमभ्युद्धृतम् । उद् हरतिक्रियां विशिनष्टि । उदा विशिष्टामभिर्विशिनष्टि । तत्र गतिरनन्तर इति च प्राप्नोति गतिर्गताविति च । गतिरनन्तर इत्यस्यावकाशः प्रकृतं प्रहृतम् । गतिर्गतावित्यस्यावकाशो ऽभ्युद्धरत्युपसमादधाति । इहोभयं प्राप्नोत्यभ्युद्धृतमुपसंहृतमुपसमाहितम् । गतिर्गताविन्येतद्भवति विप्रतिषेधेन । एवं तर्हि सिद्धे सति यदनन्तरग्रहणं करोति तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यो भवत्येषा कृद्ग्रहणे गतिकारकपूर्वस्यापीति ॥...... Kaiyaṭa: कथमिति । अपूर्वपदत्वादुच्छब्दस्य गतिस्वरो न प्राप्नोतीति तदर्थमनन्तरग्रहणं स्यादिति मत्वा प्रश्नः ॥ उद् हरतिक्रियामिति । उच्छब्देन हरतेः संबन्धादेक उद्धृतशब्दयोः समासः । तत्रोच्छब्दस्य पूर्वपदत्वाद्भवति गतिस्वरः । पश्चादभिशब्दस्य समासेऽभेर्गतिस्वरं बाधित्वा निघातेन भाव्यम् । तत्र कृदुत्तरपदप्रकृतिस्वरेणोद एव गतिस्वरो भविष्यति नार्थोऽनन्तरग्रहणेन । अथवोद् हरतिक्रियामित्यादिनाभेर्गतित्वं प्रतिपाद्यते ॥ एवं तर्हीति । परविप्रतिषेधमनपेक्ष्य व्यवहितगतिनिवृत्त्यर्थमनन्तरग्रहणं क्रियते । यदि च कृद्ग्रहणपरिभाषा न स्यात्ततः क्तान्त उत्तरपदे गतेः

When,[1] however, the word अनन्तरः 'immediately preceding' is once employed (in P. VI., 2, 49), the 'immediate precedence' denoted thereby can be no other than the immediate precedence (of a Gati) in regard to a root which is postulated by a Gati; (so far then as P. VI., 2, 49 is concerned, only the portion भृत of अभ्युद्धृत can be considered as क्तान्त 'ending with क' and) it is therefore quite correct (that the Gati उद् of अभ्युद्धृत should by P. VI., 2, 49 retain, and that अभि should lose, its original accent).

Nor would it be correct to say[2] that the (word अनन्तरः) has been employed (in P. VI., 2, 49) in order that in अभ्युद्धृत etc.,

---

स्वरो विधीयमानो व्यवहितस्य न प्राप्नोतीति किं तन्निवृत्त्यर्थेनानन्तरग्रहणेन तत्कृतमेतां परिभाषां ज्ञापयति परिभाषाज्ञापनार्थमेव च परविप्रतिषेधो नापेक्ष्यते ॥ ननु च कृद्ग्रहणे गतिपूर्वस्यापि ग्रहणं ज्ञाप्यतां कारकपूर्वस्य कथं ज्ञाप्यते । उच्यते । पूर्वाचार्यैस्तावदेषा परिभाषा पठितेह त्वनन्तरग्रहणेनासावभ्यनुज्ञायते ॥.

1. Hereby Nâgojîbhaṭṭa refutes the opinion that, notwithstanding the employment of अनन्तरः in VI., 2, 49, अभि of अभ्युद्धृत ought by that rule to retain its own accent, just because by the present Paribhâshâ उद्धृत is क्तान्त and because therefore अभि immediately precedes a second member of a compound that ends with क.

2. An opponent might say: 'The word अनन्तरः in P. VI., 2, 49 does not convey the sense which has been ascribed to it above (तद्धि—अतिव्याप्तिवारणार्थम्), but it has another meaning and it can therefore not be regarded as the Jnâpaka of this Paribhâshâ. Without अनन्तरः the rule P. VI., 2, 49 would have no concern with the उद् of अभ्युद्धृत because the term पूर्वपदम् is valid in that rule, whereas उद् in अभ्युद्धृत is no longer the first member of a compound. We should therefore apply P. VI., 2, 144 to अभ्युद्धृत and make this word by that rule antodâtta. P. VI., 2, 49 would, if it did not contain the word अनन्तरः, not apply to words like अभ्युद्धृत, but only to words with one Gati, such as उद्धृत etc. But if we read अनन्तरः in P. VI., 2, 49, पूर्वपदम् can of course no longer be valid and the rule गतिरनन्तरः must supersede P.

when (उद्धृत) is compounded with अभि, the उद् which immediately precedes (धृत) may retain its accent, although it is not the first member of a compound; for the udâtta accentuation of उद् (in अभ्युद्धृत) would (in the absence of अनन्तरः) result from P. VI., 2, 139 because the accentuation which is taught in P. VI., 2, 144 would not concern (अभ्युद्धृत) on account of the restrictive rule, that a word-form ending with क्त (which is the second member of a compound such as उद्धृत) the first member of which is a Gati, is only then antodâtta when (the whole compound) follows (as the second member of a new compound) upon a noun which denotes a case-relation, (but not when it follows,

---

VI., 2, 144. The sequence of the rules which might be applied to अभ्युद्धृत is as follows:

*a.* P. VI., 1, 223. Samâsa antodâtta.

*b.* P. VI., 2, 2. Avyaya-pûrvapada-prakṛitisvara.

*c.* P. VI., 2, 139. Kṛit after Gati has Prakṛitisvara.

*d.* P. VI., 2, 144. Ktânta uttarapada after a Gati is antodâtta.

*e.* P. VI., 2, 49. गतिरनन्तरः; उद् of अभ्युद्धृत retains its own accent. The object of अनन्तरः is, to make P. VI., 2, 49 supersede all the preceding rules, and therefore it cannot be a Jnâpaka.'

The above is thus refuted: 'The restrictive rule कारकादेव परं गतिपूर्वपदं क्तान्तमन्तोदात्तम् shows that P. VI., 2, 144 cannot be applicable to अभ्युद्धृत and that it can for this very reason not prevent the application of P. VI., 2, 139 to अभ्युद्धृत. By the latter rule उद् must in अभ्युद्धृत retain the accent which in उद्धृत had been assigned to it by P. VI., 2, 49 गतिः (without अनन्तरः); for उद्धृत being (by the present Paribhâshâ) a Kṛit, and अभि being a Gati, P. VI., 2, 139 does apply to अभ्युद्धृत. The word अनन्तरः in P. VI., 2, 49 is consequently entirely superfluous and cannot have been employed by Pâṇini for any other purpose than for the sake of indicating the existence of the present Paribhâshâ.'

as is the case *e. g.* in अभ्युद्धृत, upon a Gati. This restrictive rule 'कारकाद्दत्तश्रुतयोः' we obtain) by separating कारकात् from the rule P. VI., 2, 148 and by supplying the word गति (from P. VI., 2, 139, क्त being valid from P. VI., 2, 145). The word अनन्तरः has been employed therefore solely for the sake of preventing (the rule P. VI., 2, 49) from applying to any (Gati) which may be separated (from the root by another Gati) and it cannot therefore but indicate (the existence of the present Paribhâshâ).[1]

The meaning (of the Paribhâshâ) is this, that wherever that word-form (which by Paribh. XXIII. would be regarded as) ending with a Kṛit-affix is combined with a Gati or with a noun that denotes a case-relation, there the Kṛit-affix can only denote that word-form together with that (Gati or noun; and) the word अपि 'moreover' (of the Paribhâshâ) shows that, on the other hand, where that word-form is not combined (with a Gati or with a noun that denotes a case-relation, there the Kṛit-affix denotes that word-form) by itself.[2] Otherwise, (*i. e.*

---

1. *Viz.* it indicates the existence of the whole Paribhâshâ by indicating the existence of part of it.

2. The term अनञ्पूर्वे in P. VII., 1, 37 shows that only Paribhâshâ XXIII. applies in this rule, and not Paribhâshâ XXVIII.; for, if the latter Paribhâshâ did apply, अनञ्पूर्वे would be superfluous. Suppose we did apply both Paribhâshâs and read the Sûtra simply 'समासे क्त्वो ल्यप्'; as the rule contains the word समासे we could not apply it to forms like कृत्वा; we ought consequently to give up Paribhâshâ XXIII. and ought to apply only the other Paribhâshâ. According to the latter, क्त्वा would denote only a Gerund preceded by a Gati, not a Gerund preceded by the negative अ. Our rule समासे क्त्वो ल्यप् would teach then the substitution of ल्यप् only in forms like प्र + कृत्वा, but it would not teach the substitution of ल्यप् in forms like अकृत्वा. This would be exactly

if the present Paribhâshâ did not contain the word अपि 'moreover,') it would, wherever Kṛit-affixes might be employed, necessarily supersede Paribhâshâ XXIII. because it follows upon (that Paribhâshâ)[1]; and this is the reason why अपि 'moreover' has been employed (in the Paribhâshâ). The above

what Pâṇini intended to teach and the employment of अनञ्पूर्वे would therefore appear to be entirely useless. Pâṇini, however, does employ the word अनञ्पूर्वे, and by doing so he indicates that only Paribh. XXIII. shall be applied to the क्त्वा of VII., 1, 37. As soon as we apply only Paribh. XXIII., the prohibition contained in अनञ्पूर्वे becomes necessary, and the meaning of VII., 1, 37 is नञ्सदृशादव्ययात्तदात्मन्यासक्तिन्यायात्समासावयवात्परस्य धात्वादेः क्त्वान्तस्य समासे क्त्वो ल्यप्. (Cf. Bhâshya and Kaiyaṭa on P. VII., 1, 37 below.)

Both Paribhâshâs XXIII. and XXVIII. cannot apply in one and the same place. In P. VII., 1, 37 Paribh. XXVIII. alone would apply if the term अनञ्पूर्वे did not indicate that Paribh. XXIII. has to be applied there. P.

1. Kaiyaṭa on P. VII., 1, 37 says that Paribh. XXVIII. is *para* in regard to Paribhâshâ XXIII. because the latter is derived from P. I., 4, 13 whereas the existence of Paribh. XXVIII. is indicated by the word अनन्तरः in P. VI., 2, 49.—The present Paribhâshâ does not supersede Paribh. XXIII.; hereby the opinion of Sîradeva that Paribh. XXVIII. in an Apavâda of Paribh. XXIII., is rejected. According to Kaiyaṭa on P. VII., 1, 37, Paribh. XXIII. does, in the formation of व्याघ्रलेखी, व्याघ्रचर्चा etc., not apply to the affix णच् in P. V., 4, 14 because it is in that case rejected by Paribh. XXVI. Paribh. XXVIII. alone applies there, but it does not by its own force supersede Paribh. XXIII.; and although the Tadâdi-niyama of Paribh. XXIII. is rejected by Par. XXVI; the application of Paribh. XXVIII. to णच् is nevertheless necessary in order that णच् may denote the णजन्त when preceded by a Gati etc., but not when it is preceded by something else.

proves[1] the correctness of a remark (made by the author) of the Bhâshya on P. IV., 1, 48, 'that when according to Paribh. LXXV. and the present Paribhâshâ[2] a compound is formed (of the Gati सम्) and of (कूटिन्) which ends with the Kṛit-affix (इनुण्), and when अण् is added to the *whole* (संकूटिन्,) the result is सांकूटिनम्, but not संकौटिनम्. (If,) on the other hand, (Paribh. XXIII. and XXVIII. were both applicable in one and the same place, the affix) अण् might have been added also to the separate (portion) कूटिन् in संकूटिन्, because that (portion) might (by Paribh. XXIII.) likewise have been (regarded as) ending with इनुण्, and in that case it would have been difficult to prevent the formation of the incorrect form (संकौटिनम्) which should have been formed on this alternative.—And all this is found in the Bhâshya and in Kaiyaṭa's (commentary) on P. VII., 1, 37.—In P. VI., 2, 49, however,[3] a word-form

---

1. अत एव *i. e.* तत्समभिव्याहारे तद्विशिष्टस्यैव ग्रहणमित्याद्यर्थोऽस्मिकारादिव. P.

2. Both Paribhâshâs LXXV. and XXVIII. are necessary, as may be seen from the Bhâshya and from Kaiyaṭa's remark on P. IV., 1, 48. प्रातिपदिकात् being valid in P. V., 4, 15 the meaning of this rule is 'इनुणन्तात्प्रातिपदिकादण्.' According to Paribh. XXVIII. alone संकूटिन् would be इनुणन्त but it would not, merely as a Kṛidanta, be a Prâtipadika, for the employment of the term समास in P. I., 2, 46 shows that of all combinations of words compounds alone are termed Prâtipadikas. Paribh. XXVIII. alone therefore would not enable us to add the Taddhita-affix अण् to the whole संकूटिन्. We first have by Paribh. LXXV. to form the *compound* संकूटिन्, and to this compound which, as such, is a Prâtipadika, and which by Paribh. XXVIII. is also इनुणन्त, we have to add the affix अण्.—To the कृत् of P. I., 2, 46 only Paribh. XXIII. is applicable.

3. P. Now one might say that, if the present Paribhâshâ applies wherever a Kṛidanta is combined with a Gati, P. VI., 2, 49 ought not

without a Gati must be understood to be denoted by क्तान्त 'ending with क्त,' although that word-form (in this case) *is* combined with a Gati; for (P. VI., 2, 49) teaches an operation concerning a Gati which forms the first member of a compound[1] and is followed by a second member that ends with क्त.— And it appears from the Bhâshya[2] on P. IV., 1, 14 that this (Paribhâshâ) is applicable wherever any particular Kṛit-affix may be employed, and also wherever any general term which denotes Kṛit-affixes may be employed, but that it is not applicable where a term is employed which may denote both a Kṛit-affix and also something else than a Kṛit-affix.

---

to be applied *e. g.* to पुरोहित, because in this case the whole पुरोहित would by this Paribhâshâ be regarded as क्तान्त, and because it would on that account be impossible to separate the Gati पुरः from the क्तान्त; Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says therefore: 'In P. VI., 2, 49 however etc.' See above pag. 140.

1. पूर्वपदस्य *i. e.* वस्तुतः पूर्वपदभूतस्य । नेदमनुवृत्तिपरं तदननुवृत्तेरुक्तत्वात् । P.

2. *E. g.* The whole word कुम्भकार (P. III., 2, 1) cannot by the present Paribhâshâ be called अणन्त because अण् is not merely a Kṛit, but is also a Taddhita-affix. Cf. Bhâshya on P. IV., 1, 14: . . . . . इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम् । प्रधानेन तदन्तविधिर्यथा स्यात् । कुम्भकारी नगरकारी । अत्र हि प्रत्ययग्रहण यस्मात्स तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवतीत्यवयवादुत्पत्तिः प्राप्नोति । कृद्ग्रहणे गतिकारकपूर्वस्यापि ग्रहणं भवतीति संघातादुत्पत्तिर्भविष्यति । कृद्ग्रहण इत्युच्यते न चैतत्कृद्ग्रहणम् । कृदकृद्ग्रहणमेतत् । कृदप्ययमण् तद्धितोऽपि ॥.

Extract from the Bhâshya[1] on P. VII., 1, 37:

स्नात्वाकालकादिषु च प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्यः । स्नात्वाकालकः पीत्वास्थिरकः भुक्त्वासुहितक इति ॥ तदन्तनिर्देशात्सिद्धम् । तदन्तनिर्देशात्सिद्धमेतत् । क्त्वान्तस्य ल्यपा भवितव्यं न चैतत्क्त्वान्तम् ॥ समासनिपातनाद्वा । अथवावश्यमत्र समासार्थं निपातनं कर्तव्यम् । तेनैव यत्नेन ल्यबपि न भविष्यति ॥ अनञो वा परस्य । अथवानञः परस्य ल्यपा भवितव्यम् । न चात्रानञं पश्यामः । ननु च धातुरेवानञ् । न धातोः परस्य भवितव्यम् । किं कारणम् । नञिवयुक्तमन्यसदृशाधिकरणे तथा ह्यर्थगतिः । नञ्युक्तमिवयुक्तं चान्यस्मिंस्तत्सदृशे कार्यं विज्ञास्यते । कुत एतत् । तथा ह्यर्थो गम्यते । तद्यथाब्राह्मणमानयेत्युक्ते ब्राह्मणसदृशं पुरुषमानयति नासौ लोष्टमानीय कृती भवत्येवमिहाप्यनञिति नञ्प्रतिषेधादन्यस्मादनञो नञ्सदृशात्कार्यं विज्ञास्यते । किं चान्यदनञ् नञ्सदृशम् । पदमित्याह ॥ **अथवा** प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवतीति । एवं धातुरपि क्त्वाग्रहणेन ग्राहिष्यते । ननु चेयमपि परिभाषास्ति कृद्ग्रहणे गतिकारकपूर्वस्यापि ग्रहणं भवतीति । सापीहोपतिष्ठते । तत्र को दोषः । इह न स्यात् । प्रकृत्य प्रहृत्य । क्व तर्हि स्यात् । परमकृत्वा उत्तमकृत्वा ॥ न वा । अत्रेष्यते । अनिष्टं च प्राप्नोति । इष्टं च न सिध्यति । गतिकारकपूर्वस्यैवेष्यते । कुतो नु खल्वेतत् । द्वयोः परि-

---

1. Extract from Kaiyaṭa on the above: अथवेति । क्त्वाग्रहणेन धातुप्रत्ययसमुदायस्य परिग्रहात्तदवयवत्वाद्धातोः स्वावयवेन पौर्वापर्यासंभवाद्धातुरनञ्ग्रहणेन न गृह्यते ॥..............

आचार्य आह । न वा अत्रेष्यत इति । तस्मात्कृद्ग्रहणपरिभाषात्र नाश्रीयते ॥ चोदक आह । अनिष्टं चेति ॥ आचार्य आह । गतिकारकपूर्वस्यैवेष्यत इति । प्रकृत्य पार्श्वतःकृत्येत्यादौ ल्यबादेश इष्यते । कृद्ग्रहणपरिभाषोपस्थाने च न सिध्यतीति नासौ परिभाषाश्रीयते ॥ चोदक आह । कुतो न्विति ॥ प्रत्ययग्रहणपरिभाषाया अवकाश उपगोरपत्यमौपगव इत्यत्र तद्धितान्तस्य प्रातिपदिकत्वात्सुब्लुग्भवति । कृद्ग्रहणपरिभाषाया अवकाशो व्यावलेखी व्यावचर्चीति णचः स्त्रियामञिति गतिपूर्वस्य णजन्तत्वादञि सति वृद्धिस्वरौ भवतः । अत्र

भाषयोः सावकाशयोः समवस्थितयोः प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स विहितस्तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवति कृद्ग्रहणे गतिकारकपूर्वस्येतीयमिह परिभाषा भवति प्रत्ययग्रहणे यस्मात्स तदादेर्ग्रहणं भवतीतीयं न भवति कृद्ग्रहणे गतिकारकपूर्वस्यापीति । आचार्यप्रवृत्तिर्ज्ञापयतीयमिह परिभाषा भवति प्रत्ययग्रहण इतीयं न भवति कृद्ग्रहण इति **यदयमन**ञिति प्रतिषेधं शास्ति । कथं कृत्वा ज्ञापकम् । अयं हि नञ् न गतिर्न च कारकम् । तत्र कः प्रसङ्गोऽयं नञ्पूर्वस्य स्यात् । पश्यति त्वाचार्य इयमिह परिभाषा भवति प्रत्ययग्रहण इतीयं न भवति कृद्ग्रहण इति । ततोऽनञिति प्रतिषेधं शास्ति ॥ किं नञः प्रतिषेधेन न गतिर्न च कारकम् । यावता नञ्पूर्वे तु ल्यबभावो न भविष्यति प्रतिषेधात्तु जानीमस्तत्पूर्वं नेह गृह्यते । **प्रत्ययग्रहणे** यावत्तावद्भवितुमर्हति ॥

---

हि प्रत्ययग्रहणपरिभाषायाः स्त्रीप्रत्यये चानुपसर्जने नेति प्रतिषेधात्तदुपस्थानाभावः । एवं सावकाशयोः परिभाषयोर्भिन्नफलयोर्विरोधान्यतरयोऽप्रतिपत्तिर्वा प्राप्नोति । प्रत्ययग्रहणपरिभाषायामाश्रीयमाणायां प्रकृत्येति गतेः क्त्वान्तेऽनन्तर्भावात्पौर्वापर्योपपत्तौ ल्यप्सिध्यति न तु कृद्ग्रहणपरिभाषाश्रयण इति फलभेदः । कार्यकालं संज्ञापरिभाषमित्यत्र दर्शने समानदेशत्वात्परिभाषयोः परत्वेनापि व्यवस्था नास्ति । सांकूटिने त्वेवमव्यवस्थाप्रसङ्गाद्यथोद्देशपक्ष आश्रयितव्यः । तत्र हि परत्वेन व्यवस्थासिद्धिः । प्रत्ययग्रहणपरिभाषाङ्गसंज्ञासूत्रे योगविभागेन व्यवस्थापिता । कृद्ग्रहणपरिभाषा तु गतिरनन्तर इत्यत्रानन्तरग्रहणेन ज्ञापनात्परा भवति ॥ यदयमिति । कथं पुनरेतज्ज्ञापकं यावता सत्यामपि कृद्ग्रहणपरिभाषायामपिशब्दात्केवलस्यापि क्त्वान्तस्य ग्रहणादकृत्वेत्यादौ नञोऽगतित्वादकारकत्वाच्च क्त्वान्तेऽनन्तर्भावादसत्यनञ्ग्रहणे ल्यप्प्रसङ्गो ऽप्रकृत्येत्यादौ च प्रतिषेधार्थमनञ्पूर्वस्य ग्रहणं स्यात् । उच्यते । अपिग्रहणेन प्रत्ययग्रहणपरिभाषा समुच्चीयते न त्वन्यपूर्वम् । तत्र समास इति वचनात्केवलस्य कृत्वादेर्ग्रहणाभावादपिशब्दसमुच्चेतव्यस्याभावाद्गतिकारकपूर्वस्यैव समासस्य ग्रहणं भविष्यतीति किमनञ्पूर्व इत्यनेन । तन्क्रियमाणं कृद्ग्रहणपरिभाषाया अनुपस्थानं ज्ञापयति । तदुपस्थाने तु तूष्णींभूय नानाभूय द्विधाभूयेत्यादौ ल्यब्न स्यात् । तदेवं कृद्ग्रहणपरिभाषानुपस्थाने नञ्सदृशादव्ययात्पदात्प्रत्यासत्तिन्यायात्समासावयवात्परस्य धात्वादेः क्त्वान्तस्य समासे क्त्वो ल्यब्विधीयमानं स्वात्वाकालकः परमकृत्वेत्यादौ न भवति । परमं कृत्वा परमकृत्वेति सन्महत् [ २. १. ६१ ] इति समासः परमत्वस्य क्रियाविशेषणत्वात्सामानाधिकरण्यात् ॥ तत्पूर्वमिति । गतिकारकपूर्वमित्यर्थः ॥ प्रत्ययग्रहण इति । प्रत्ययग्रहणपरिभाषाया यावद्ग्राह्यं तावद्गृह्यते ॥

---

## Paribhâshâ XXIX.

**P. XXIX: (A word or base which occurs in a rule) in which (the term) पद or अङ्ग is valid, (denotes) both that (word or base by itself) and (it denotes) also (any word or base) which ends with that (word or base).**

What ought to be qualified (by the word or base that may occur in a rule where this Paribhâshâ is applicable) is a Pada, or a base, and (the word or base) which qualifies these (qualifies them in accordance with P. I., 1, 72 in such a manner that they must be regarded) as ending with that (word or base which occurs in the rule). This is a more developed form of the rule P. I., 1, 72.

Accordingly short (अ is substituted) by P. VI., 3, 65 (where उत्तरपदे[1] is valid from P. VI., 3, 1, for the final आ not only of इष्टका, but also *e. g.* of पक्केष्टका), a circumstance which accounts for the formation of इष्टकचितम्, पक्केष्टकचितम् etc.; (similarly) long (आ is substituted) by P. VI., 4, 10 (where अङ्गस्य is valid from P. VI., 4, 1, for the penultimate अ not only of महत्, but also *e. g.* of परममहत्, परमातिमहत्, and) this accounts for the formation of महान्, परममहान्, परमातिमहान् etc. The fact (that P. VI., 4, 10 concerns also परमातिमहत्) proves, as appears from the Bhâshya,[2] that the reading तदुत्तरपदस्य '(a compound) of which that (word or base) is the second member' (instead of

1. It will be stated below that पदाधिकार in this Paribhâshâ denotes also उत्तरपदाधिकार; cf. Kaiyaṭa on P. I., 1, 72: पदशब्देनोत्तरपदं गृह्यते पदैकदेशलोपात् । उत्तरपदेन सामर्थ्यादाक्षिप्तं पूर्वपदमिष्टकादिभिर्विशेष्यते ॥

2. Cf. Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72; Ed. Ballantyne pag. 792. There the Vârttika पदाङ्गाधिकारे तस्य च तदुत्तरपदस्य च is given, and further on

तदन्तस्य) is incorrect. The word पदाधिकार in this (Paribhâshâ denotes[1] a rule) in which (the term) उत्तरपद is valid and also (a rule) in which merely पद is valid. To suit the various forms (that have to be accounted for by the rules of grammar, the word पाद) in P. VI, 3, 52 does (contrary to the present Paribhâshâ) not denote (words) ending with पाद (but it denotes only पाद by itself).[2] All this is found in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72.

---

it is shown that if this Vârttika be adopted, the restriction अलैवानर्थकेन (तदन्तविधिः) of P. I., 1, 72 becomes unnecessary. Then the question is raised whether it be better to adopt the Vârttika पदाङ्गाधिकारे तस्य च तदुत्तरपदस्य च or to retain P. I., 1, 72 with the restriction अलैवानर्थकेन, a question which is answered in favour of the latter alternative, because thus the formation of परमातिमहान् also can be accounted for. The latter cannot be formed by means of the Vârttika पदाङ्गाधिकारे तस्य च तदुत्तरपदस्य च, because परमातिमहत् is neither महत् nor a compound the second member of which is महत्, the second member of the compound being अतिमहत्.

1. केवलपदाधिकारश्च; *scil.* गृह्यते. P.

2. According to the remarks in the Bhâshya on the Vârttika पदाङ्गाधिकारे तस्य च तदुत्तरपदस्य च the portion तदुत्तरपदस्य च of this Vârttika does not apply to पाद्, nor to पाद, (for which पद् is substituted), in a Padâdhikâra, but it applies only to पाद् and पाद in the Angâdhikâra. It applies therefore *e. g.* in P. VI., 4, 130 (cf. द्विपदः पश्य), but not in P. VI., 3, 54. According to the latter rule one has to form पत्काषी, but one can, as Kaiyaṭa observes, say only परमपादेन कषति, परमपादकाषी, (not परमपत्काषी). When one wishes to say परमः पत्काषी, one has of course to form परमपत्काषी. In the same manner the portion तदुत्तरपदस्य च does not refer to पाद in P. VI., 3, 52; by this rule one forms पादोपहतम्, पदोपहतम्, but दिग्धपादोपहतम् becomes दिग्धपादोपहतम्, and not दिग्धपदोपहतम्.

## Paribhâshâ XXX.

(P. IV., 1, 95 अत इञ् teaches that, in order to denote a descendant, the affix इञ् is added to a Prâtipadika which is अत् i. e. अ. Here then) one might say that, (as neither पद nor अङ्ग is valid in P. IV., 1, 95, the term अत् of this rule ought by P. I., 1, 72 to denote a Prâtipadika ending with अ, but that it ought not to denote the Prâtipadika अ, and that consequently) इञ् ought not to be added to (the Prâtipadika) अ (*i. e.* 'Vishṇu') to denote 'a descendant of A,' just because this Prâtipadika does not end with अ.[1] To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

P. XXX: (An operation which affects) something on account of some special designation which (for certain reasons) attaches to the latter, (affects) likewise that which stands alone (and to which therefore, just because the reasons for it do not exist, that special designation does not attach).

The meaning is this: *Vyapades'in* is that which for certain reasons has received some special designation, *i. e.* is called by a name which expresses what that to which it is assigned, actually is; when, on the other hand, something which stands alone has not that special designation, because the reasons for it do not exist, it is, so far as the application to it of some (grammatical) operation is concerned, equal to that (to which

---

1. अ cannot be called the end of अ because the definition of the word 'end,' सत्यन्यस्मिन्यस्मात्परं नास्ति पूर्वमस्ति सोऽन्त इत्युच्यते '*end* is called that which, while it is accompanied by something else, is not followed by anything, but is preceded by something' (Mahâbhâshya, Ed. Ballantyne p. 406), does not apply to it.

the special designation does attach), and an operation (which affects that to which the special designation does attach), must consequently affect also that which stands alone.[1] Because, accordingly, also the letter अ ends with ă, (P. IV., 1, 95 may be applied to the Prâtipadika अ, just as it may be applied *e. g.* to दक्ष etc., and) it can therefore not be incorrect (to form इ in the sense of 'a descendant of A').

On account of the employment (in this Paribhâshâ) of the word एकस्मिन् 'that which stands alone' the letter आ in सभासंनयन cannot be (regarded as) the *first* (vowel of that word) nor can the letter इ in the root दरिद्रा be (regarded as) *final.* (Had), on the other hand, (एकस्मिन् not been employed, the letter आ in सभासंनयन might, when taken by itself, have been regarded as the *first* vowel; the whole word would in that case have been termed *vriddha* by P. I., 1, 73, and) the affix छ would by P. IV., 2, 114 have been added (to it) to express the meaning सभासंनयने भवः; in like manner (the letter इ of दरिद्रा might, when considered by itself, have been regarded as *final,* and the affix) अच् which

1. In a Prâtipadika like दक्ष the letter अ is final, because it is accompanied by other letters, has no letters after it, but is preceded by other letters; consequently दक्ष receives the *Vyapades'a* अदन्त 'ending with अ' which expresses what दक्ष really is, and P. IV., 1, 95 applies to it. In the Prâtipadika अ, on the other hand, अ cannot properly be called final, because it is not accompanied by other letters etc.; the Prâtipadika अ ought therefore not to be called अदन्त 'ending with अ,' and P. IV., 1, 95 ought not to apply to it. The present Paribhâshâ, however, teaches that the same operation which affects *e. g.* दक्ष because it is अदन्त, affects also the अ which stands alone (and which properly ought not to be called अदन्त), and P. IV., 1, 95 applies therefore also to the Prâtipadika अ.

(according to P. III., 3, 56) is added to roots ending with the vowel इ, might have been added to दरिद्रा. For the same reason the सु in हरिषु etc. is not termed a 'Pada'.[1] In ordinary life, likewise, a man does not, provided he has many sons, call one of them his eldest and his youngest son etc., by saying 'this is my eldest (son), my youngest, my second etc.,' but (he does so) only in case that he has only one son.

And[2] by this (Paribhâshâ) something which is not taught in grammar, may likewise be ascribed (to that which stands alone). This is the reason why reduplication, (the taking place of) which depends on there being something which contains one vowel (and which therefore ought to be something more than one vowel), does take place *e. g.* in the Perfect of इ[3] (notwithstanding that इ is nothing but a vowel.) For the same reason is भू in भवति etc. termed 'Anga' (in regard to

---

1. If एकस्मिन् had not been employed in the Paribhâshâ, सु would have been termed a Pada because it would by the Paribhâshâ व्यपदेशिवत् have been regarded not only as सुबन्त 'ending with सुप्,' but also as यस्माद्विहितस्तदादि 'beginning with that to which it has been added.' (P.: अन्यथा यस्माद्विहितस्तदादित्वस्याशास्त्रीयस्यानयातिदेशात्तत्त्वं दुर्वारमिति भाव:; see below.)

2. Nâgojîbhaṭṭa, being about to censure Kaiyaṭa, gives herewith his own Siddhânta. अपि 'likewise' indicates that that which is taught in one of Pâṇini's rules is likewise ascribed to that which stands alone. शास्त्रीय means here 'taught in a rule'; *e. g.* the अदन्तत्व in the case of भस्यापत्यमि: is *s'âstrîya* because it is taught in P. I., 1, 21, but the एकाच्त्व in the case of इ, इयाय, and the यस्माद्विहितस्तदादित्व in the case of भवति (see below) etc. are अशास्त्रीय 'not taught in a rule.'

3. *Viz.* because एकाच्त्व which properly belongs only to पच् etc., and which is not taught in any rule of grammar, is by this Paribhâshâ ascribed to इ etc., and because we are thereby enabled to apply the rules of reduplication P. VI., 1, 1, etc. also to the latter.

the following शप्, although भू does not begin with भू but is nothing else than भू );[1] similarly इयत् etc. is on the Kâryakâla-paksha termed a 'Prâtipadika,' a term which ought not to be applied except to that which *ends* with a Taddhita-affix, (whereas इयत् is nothing but a Taddhita-affix.[2] Were), on the other hand, (something that is not taught in grammar not by this Paribhâshâ ascribed to that which stands alone, भू ) could not have been (termed 'Anga,' nor इयत् 'ending with a Taddhita' and 'Prâtipadika'), because (in that case) neither could have been (regarded as) beginning with that to which (the affixes शप् and वत्) have been added.[3]

---

1. In भवति, भव is by P. I., 4, 13 termed 'Anga' in regard to the termination ति, because it is यस्मात्प्रत्ययविधिस्तदादि *i. e.* because भव begins with that (भू) to which the affix ति has been added. But भू would in regard to शप्, which is likewise an affix, not be termed 'Anga,' because it does not *begin* with that to which शप् has been added, if by the present Paribhâshâ यस्मात्प्रत्ययविधिस्तदादित्व were not ascribed to it.

2. According to P. I., 2, 46 a Taddhitânta like दाक्षि (*i. e.* दक्ष + इ) is termed Prâtipadika; इयत् is properly not a Taddhitânta, but is only a Taddhita, because its base इदम् has disappeared (see pag. 118, note 1) and it ought therefore not to be termed Prâtipadika. By the present Paribhâshâ however तद्धितान्तत्व is ascribed to इयत् and the latter is therefore likewise called a Prâtipadika.—The इत्यादौ 'etc.' after इयान् includes अधुना etc.; cf. P. V., 3, 17, Si. Kau. I, 693.—कार्यकालपक्षे, P.: तस्यैव मुख्यत्वादिति भावः; Râghavendra: यथोद्देशे तु स्थानिवत्त्वेनैव प्रातिपदिकत्वसिद्धिरिति भावः.

3. *Viz.* because यस्मात्प्रत्ययविधिस्तदादित्व, being not taught in any of Pânini's rules, would not by this Paribhâshâ have been ascribed to भू and इयत्.—In the same manner in which the Paribhâshâ is applied in the case of भू and इयत्, it must be applied also in the case of इ, इयाय,

But when Kaiyaṭa[1] maintains that (the root इ) has the special designation एकाच् 'containing one vowel' (which implies that इ is something more than one vowel), because that which possesses a meaning may be (considered both as) void of that meaning and (as) endowed with it, so that, when about to form *e. g.* the Perfect of इ, one may say 'this one vowel (इ), considered merely as a letter, of the root (इ) endowed with a meaning,' (and when Kaiyaṭa then applies the present Paribhâshâ), he is wrong, because that (root इ endowed with a meaning) is called एकाच्, a term which (in this case) expresses what इ actually is, in the same manner in which according to the Bhâshya in एकपदा ऋक् 'a Ṛich containing one Pâda' (the term एकपदा expresses what the Ṛich really is, and because under these circumstances the present Paribhâshâ becomes inapplicable). It has been said in the Bhâshya that in एकपदा ऋक् the special designation (एकपदा) is connected with the meaning, (*i. e.* that the Ṛich as a meaning is qualified by the Bahuvrîhi-compound एकपदा).[2] The import of this (passage of the Bhâshya) so far as the meaning (of एकपदा ऋक् is concerned) in this that, because what

---

*i. e.* एकाच्त्व must be ascribed to इ, and Kaiyaṭa's view, which will now be stated, cannot therefore be correct.

1. According to Kaiyaṭa, इ can really be called एकाच्, because besides containing one vowel it contains also a meaning. But, if this view be adopted, the present Paribhâshâ cannot be applied to इ, because in that case एकाच् is a *vyapades'a* and इ *vyapades'in.* See Mahâbhâshya, Ed. Ballantyne p. 408.

2. Cf. Bhâshya Ed. Ball. p. 409. भवति चैतदेकस्मिन्नपि । एकवर्णं पदम् एकपदर्क् एकर्चं सूक्तमिति। अत्राप्यर्थेन युक्तो व्यपदेशः । पदं नामार्थ ऋङ्नामार्थः सूक्तं नामार्थ इति ॥ Kaiyaṭa: अत्राप्यर्थेनेति । पदादीनां योऽर्थः सोऽन्यपदार्थ इत्यर्थः । अभेदोपचारादर्थ एव पदादिभिरभिधीयते ॥

one calls a Ṛich etc. is both a meaning and also certain sounds, (one may say) 'the Pâda, considered merely as certain sounds, forms one part of that (Ṛich).' As one then by assigning several properties to an only (son) may call him equally 'the eldest, (the youngest)' etc., and as one in such expressions as 'the body of a round stone-piece,' by ascribing various states to the one (stone-piece) and by thus ascribing to it an existence in various (states) etc., may speak of its body[1] etc., in the same manner[2] one may (also) in the case (of इ, इयाय etc.) without impropriety speak (of इ etc.) as 'containing one vowel' etc., and this (Paribhâshâ) is therefore established by a maxim of ordinary life.

And it cannot be said that, as this (Paribhâshâ) concerns only that which is not accompanied by anything else, भू in भवति ought not (by this Paribhâshâ to be considered as यस्मात्प्रत्ययविधिस्तदादि and ought therefore not) to be termed 'Anga' (in regard to the following शप्), because (भू) *is* accompanied (by शप् etc.); for as शप् is the cause[3] of the assignment of the term 'Anga' (to भू), the latter, so far as its being that which begins with that to which (शप्) has been added, is concerned, is not accompanied by anything. The case is the same as when in ordinary life a man who has (only) one son, even though he

1. P. वयस्कृतावस्थानामपि प्राणिनिष्ठत्वेन वस्तुतस्तत्रासत्त्वादाह। आरोपितेति ॥ समुदायरूपत्वेति। अनेकावस्थाविशिष्टशिलापुत्रकत्वेत्यर्थः। आदिनैकावस्थाविशिष्टशिलापुत्रकत्वपरिग्रहः ॥ तस्येति। अनेकावस्थाविशिष्टशिलापुत्रकस्यैकावस्थाविशिष्टमिदं शरीरमवयव इत्यादिव्यवहार इत्यर्थः ॥. In reality the body does not form part of the round stone-piece because the latter is nothing else than the body; it exists only in this one state, *viz.* as body.

2. But not in the way in which Kaiyaṭa calls इ एकाच्.

3. अङ्गत्वे कार्ये; जन्यजनकभावः सप्तम्यर्थः। तज्जनकीभूत इति यावत् ॥ P.

possesses children of the other sex, *viz.* daughters etc., calls that same son his eldest etc.[1] Nor can one say that, (if this Paribhâshâ did) then (apply only to that which is not accompanied by anything else,) the statement in the Bhâshya (on P. VI., 1, 1) 'that there are in निज् four things which contain one vowel (*viz.* नि, निज्, इ, and इज्)' would be incorrect because (in this case) the letter इ, being really accompanied by something else (*viz.* by न् and ज्), cannot (in accordance with this Paribhâshâ) fitly be said to contain one vowel; for that (statement) has been made without any regard to the word एकस्मिन् (of the present Paribhâshâ).[2]

The word[3] अर्थवत् 'possessed of a meaning' in the expression अर्थवता व्यपदेशिवद्भावः likewise denotes by implication that (that which is possessed of a meaning) is (at the same time) not accompanied by anything else. The meaning of that (expression) is, that a word which possesses a meaning, (although on account

---

1. भ् is not accompanied by anything *sajâtîya, i. e.* by anything which, like itself, is कार्यिन्; the शप् by which it is accompanied is, as the निमित्त of the term अङ्ग, *vijâtîya.*

2. And this shows that that statement of the Bhâshya belongs to the Pûrvapakshin, and not to the Siddhântin.

3. P. Now one might say: 'It follows from the expression of the Bhâshyakâra अर्थवता व्यपदेशिवद्भावः that Patanjali approves only of that meaning of the present Paribhâshâ which has been assigned to it by Kaiyaṭa, on the ground that, wherever (in interpretation) *Ekavâkyatâ* is possible (as is the case in the explanation of अर्थवता व्यपदेशिवद्भावः), *Vâkyabheda* (which we see in the explanation of व्यपदेशिवदेकस्मिन्, the meaning being असहाये तत्कार्यं कर्तव्यं ससहाये तु न,) ought not to be had recourse to, and Kaiyaṭa has therefore been censured unjustly.' To refute this Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says: 'The word अर्थवत् etc.'

of the absence of certain causes a particular designation may not attach to it), undergoes the same operation as another word to which that particular designation does attach. (We said that the word अर्थवत् denotes by implication that that which is possessed of a meaning is at the same time not accompanied by anything else), because usually[1] only that is possessed of a meaning which is not accompanied by anything else.

In[2] (the formation of) कुरुते etc. (from कुरुत etc.) the letter

---

1. Not always; *e. g.* in forms like अधीते in which a root is accompanied by a preposition, which does not convey a meaning but is merely *dyotaka*, the root accompanied by something else possesses a meaning. But though this is the case, nevertheless, wherever the present Paribhâshâ may be applicable, the अर्थवत् is असहाय and अर्थवत् does therefore imply असहायत्व.

2. One might maintain, that the अ of the Âtmanepada termination त of कुरु—त cannot be termed टि, because it is accompanied by something else, *viz.* by त्, and because therefore the present Paribhâshâ ought not to apply to it. Nâgojibhaṭṭa says therefore: 'In the formation of कुरुते etc.' Although अ has a *vijâtîya* companion त्, it has no *sajâtîya* companion, because the Âtmanepada termination त contains no other vowel besides अ; the Paribhâshâ is therefore applicable to it. By it अ may be considered as 'beginning with the last vowel of त,' and it is consequently termed टि and undergoes the operation taught in P. III., 4, 79.—Hereby the opinion is refuted that this Paribhâshâ and अर्थवता व्यपदेशिवद्भावः are two separate Paribhâshâs. This Nâgojibhaṭṭa indicates by the concluding words इत्यन्यत्र विस्तरः; 'elsewhere' *i. e.* in the Uddyota etc.—Cf. the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 21, Ed. Ballantyne pag. 406, of which the following is a short analysis:

1. आदि and अन्त are defined thus: 'आदि is that which, while it is accompanied by something else, is not preceded by anything but is followed by something;' 'अन्त is that which, while it is accompanied

अ of the syllable त is, so far as the expression 'last of the vowels' and the expression 'that which begins with it' are concerned, decidedly not accompanied by anything else, and as therefore the present Paribhâshâ does apply to it, it is termed

---

by something else, is not followed by anything but is preceded by something.' These definitions accepted, the rule आद्यन्तवदेकस्मिन् becomes necessary.

2. (*a.*) It is objected that Pâṇini, to give a more comprehensive rule, should have said 'व्यपदेशिवदेकस्मिन्.' For what object? एकाचो द्वे प्रथमार्थम् । वक्ष्यत्येकाचो द्वे प्रथमस्य [ ६. १. १ ] इति बहुव्रीहिनिर्देश इति । तस्मिन्क्रियमाण इहैव स्यात् । पपाच पपाठ । इयाय आर इत्यत्र न स्यात् । व्यपदेशिवदेकस्मिन्कार्यं भवतीत्यत्रापि सिद्धं भवति ॥ षत्वे चादेशसंप्रत्ययार्थम् । वक्ष्यत्यादेशप्रत्ययोः [ ८. ३. ५९ ] इत्यवयवषष्ठ्येषेति । एतस्मिन्क्रियमाण इहैव स्यात् । करिष्यति हरिष्यति। इह न स्यात् । इन्द्रो मा वक्षत् स देवान्यक्षदिति । (Here the affix consists of only स् and स् cannot be *part* of स् ); व्यपदेशिवदेकस्मिन्कार्यं भवतीत्यत्रापि सिद्धं भवति ॥

(*b.*) Nevertheless the rule व्यपदेशिवदेकस्मिन् need not be given because it contains a maxim which is generally valid and applies therefore also in grammar.

3. Lastly the objector tries to show that the rule आद्यन्तवदेकस्मिन् is altogether superfluous. आदि, he says, is that which is not preceded by anything else, अन्त that which is not followed by anything else. If anything stands quite alone, it may according to these definitions be considered as both आदि and अन्त, and the rule आद्यन्तवदेकस्मिन् is superfluous. Patanjali (गोनर्दीयः), however, says that these definitions of आदि and अन्त are incorrect, and those given above correct, and that therefore the rule आद्यन्तवदेकस्मिन् is not superfluous.

But why is the Sûtra given at all? Does not its meaning result from the general maxim व्यपदेशिवदेकस्मिन्? This question is answered by Kaiyaṭa: यद्यपि लौकिकेन व्यपदेशिवद्भावेनाद्यन्तव्यपदेश एकस्मिन्नपि सिध्यति तथापि गौणत्वात्कार्येण न भवितव्यमिति यस्य भ्रान्तिः स्यात्तं प्रति योगो ऽयमारब्धव्यः ॥

टि (by P. I., 1, 64 and undergoes the operation which is taught in P. III., 4, 79). This has been fully discussed elsewhere.

---

4. Which are the objects of the rule आद्यन्तवदेकस्मिन् ?

*a.* आदिवत्त्वे प्रयोजनं प्रत्ययञ्निदाद्युदात्तत्वे *e. g.* कर्तव्य—औपगव. P. III., 1, 3.

*b.* वलादेरार्धधातुकस्येट् प्रयोजनम् *e. g.* करिष्यति—जोषिषत्. P. VII., 2, 35.

*c.* यस्मिन्विधिस्तदादित्वे प्रयोजनम् *e. g.* श्रियः—श्रियौ. P. VI., 4, 77.

*d.* अजाद्याट्त्वे प्रयोजनम् *e. g.* ऐहिष्ट—ऐष्ट. P. VI., 4, 72.

*e.* अन्तवद् द्विवचनान्तप्रगृह्यत्वे प्रयोजनम् *e. g.* पचेते—माले. P. I., 1, 11.

*f.* मिदचोऽन्त्यात्परः प्रयोजनम् *e. g.* कुण्डानि—यानि. P. I., 1, 47; VII., 1, 72.

*g.* अचो ऽन्त्यादि टि प्रयोजनम् *e. g.* कुर्वाथे—कुरुते.

Kaiyaṭa: कुरुत इति । अर्थवता व्यपदेशिवद्भावात्तशब्दाकारस्यानर्थकत्वादिह प्रयोजनत्वेनोपन्यासः ॥

Nâgojîbhaṭṭa: अर्थवतेति । तत्र ह्यर्थस्य त्यागोपादानाभ्यां भेदः सुकर इति भावः । इदं चिन्त्यम् । यद्यपि व्यपदेशिवद्भावेन सिध्यति तथापि गौणत्वान्नेति यस्य भ्रान्तिस्तं प्रति सूत्रारम्भ इति पूर्वग्रन्थविरोधात्सूत्रकारेण तदज्ञानात्तदुदाहरणसंभवाच्चार्थवतेति चासहायत्वस्यैवोपलक्षणं ससहायस्य प्रायेणानर्थकत्वात्तशब्दाकारश्चासहाय एव । येन सहायेनाचामन्त्यत्वस्य बहुव्रीह्यर्थस्य चोपपत्तिस्तादृशसहायाभावात् । अन्यथाद्यन्तवद्भावो ऽपि न स्यात् ॥

*h.* अलोऽन्त्यस्य प्रयोजनम् *e. g.* पटाभ्याम्—आभ्याम्. P. VII., 3, 102.

*i.* येन विधिस्तदन्तत्वे प्रयोजनम् *e. g.* चेयम्—अध्येयम्. P. III., 1, 97.

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXXI.

One[1] might say that (the affix) यञ् which (by P. IV., 1, 105)

---

1. The sequence of the Paribhâshâs XXIX.-XXXII. is thus accounted for by Pâyaguṇḍa: Paribh. XXIX. is, as has been stated, a further developed form of P. I., 1, 72. It is followed by Paribh. XXX. because the portion तस्य च in the former suggests at once the latter Paribhâshâ. Then follows Paribh. XXXI. which restricts P. I., 1, 72,

may be added to गर्ग etc., may be added also[1] to परमगर्ग etc., because (गर्ग etc. qualify प्रातिपदिकात् which is valid from P. IV., 1, 1, and) should denote (therefore according to P. I., 1, 72 Prâtipadikas) that end with (गर्ग etc.). To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

P. XXXI: That which cannot possibly be anything but a Prâtipadika[2] does (contrary to P. I., 1, 72) not denote that which ends with it, (but it denotes only itself).

---

and Paribh. XXXII. is given after XXXI., because XXXI. prevents too wide an application of P. I., 1, 72, on which Paribh. XXIX. is based, whereas Paribh. XXXII. prevents too wide an application of Paribh. XXX.

1. *I. e.* besides being added to गर्ग etc. by Vyapades'ivadbhâva.

2. *E. g.* गर्ग in IV., 1. 105 or ऋषि 'the name of a Rishi' in P. IV., 1, 114, which cannot possibly be anything else than Prâtipadikas; but not अस् in P. V., 2, 121, nor अत् in P. IV., 1, 95, nor उगित् in P. IV., 1, 6, because अस्, अत्, and उगित् do not necessarily denote a Prâtipadika, but may refer also to something else than a Prâtipadika. Nâgojîbhaṭṭa explains the word ग्रहणवत् in the following by विशिष्य *i. e.* तत्तद्रूपेण गृहीत; Pâyaguṇḍa by विशिष्य *i. e.* तत्तद्रूपेणोच्चारणवत्. Râghavendra remarks on तत्तद्रूपेण, उगिद्वर्णान्यरूपेणेत्यर्थः । तेनावृद्धाभ्यः [ ४. १. ११३ ] ऋष्यन्धकेत्यादौ न तदन्तविधिः ।; cf P. IV., 1, 114. Bhairavamis'ra comments on the same word: तत्तदित्यस्य प्रातिपदिकत्वव्याप्येत्यर्थः, and he illustrates this explanation by the following remark on the meaning of the present Paribhâshâ: अत्र यस्य प्रातिपदिकस्य सूत्रे ग्रहणमुपादानं तेन तदन्तविधिर्नास्तीत्यर्थकरणे ऽस्मायामेधास्रजो विनिः [ ५. २. १२१ ] इति सूत्रे समासघटकास्पदस्योपात्तस्य प्रातिपदिकत्वात्तदन्तविध्यभावापत्तौ यशस्वीत्यादिरूपासिद्धिरतः प्रातिपदिकत्वव्याप्यधर्मवत्त्वेनोपादानं यस्य प्रातिपदिकस्य तेन तदन्तविधिर्नास्तीत्यर्थः कार्यः । अस्त्वं तु प्रातिपदिकाप्रातिपदिकसाधारणमिति भवति तेन तदन्तविधिः ॥. Similarly the Sarvamangalâ: अत्र ग्रहणवत्त्वं च न साक्षादुपात्तत्वं किंतु प्रातिपदिकत्वव्याप्यधर्मवदुपस्थापकत्वम्.

(Accordingly गर्ग in P. IV., 1, 105 cannot denote परमगर्ग but it can only denote गर्ग by itself, and यञ् can therefore not by P. IV., 1, 105 be added to परमगर्ग). This (Paribhâshâ) conveys the same sense as the portion relating to affixes of the Vârttika (on P. I., 1, 72) according to which (P. I., 1, 72) does not apply in rules that teach the formation of a compound or the addition of an affix, except that it does apply to उगित् and to letters employed (in such rules). Therefore (the prohibition contained in) this (Paribhâshâ) is (likewise) applicable only in such rules as teach the addition of an affix. It is for this reason, that the application in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72 of this rule also to a Prâtipadika given in a rule like P. VI., 4, 11 which does not teach the addition of an affix, and the quotation of an example like स्वसा, परमस्वसा, are not at variance (with this Paribhâshâ)[1]. And for the same reason[2] (the prohibition which) this (Paribhâshâ conveys) has not, like the prohibition समासप्रत्ययविधौ etc., been mentioned in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72. That (prohibition which is contained in the Vârttika समासप्रत्ययविधौ प्रतिषेधः) refers likewise only to rules in which a Prâtipadika is given by means of some particular form.[3] This is suggested in the Bhâshya on P. V., 1, 20.[4] And (the existence of) the

1. *I. e.* P. I., 1, 72 does apply to the Prâtipadika स्वसृ in P. VI., 4, 11, because this rule does not teach the addition of an affix.

2. *Viz.* because this Paribhâshâ conveys the same sense as the portion relating to affixes of the Vârttika समासप्रत्ययविधौ......

3. *Scil.* which necessarily must denote a Prâtipadika; cf. pag. 160, note 2. The exception उगिद्वर्णग्रहणवर्जम् does not therefore teach something new, but teaches something that is contained already in समासप्रत्ययविधौ प्रतिषेधः.

4. There it is stated that Pâṇini employs the word असमासे in V.,

present (Paribhâshâ) is indicated by the rule P. V., 2, 87 सपूर्वाच्च (according to which the affix इनि which by P. V., 2, 86 is added to पूर्व, is added to पूर्व also when the latter is preceded by another word, as is the case *e. g.* in कृतपूर्वी. If), on the other hand, (the present Paribhâshâ did not exist, इनि) might already by P. V., 2, 86 have been added (to कृतपूर्व etc.) because (in that case the word पूर्व of that rule) would have denoted (any Prâti-

---

1, 20, in order to show that the Tadantavidhi applies in the preceding rule V., 1, 18 प्राग्वतेष्ठञ्, and that for this reason ठञ् may be added by P. V., 1, 18 to परमनिष्क. This however is rejected; the Nishedha ग्रहणवता etc. does not concern P. V., 1, 18, because in this rule no particular base is given to which the affix might be added, and consequently the Tadantavidhi would apply even in case Pâṇini had not said असमासे in V., 1, 20. If the Nishedha ग्रहणवता etc. were applicable both in rules where a particular Prâtipadika is given and also where this is not the case, the Bhâshya would be wrong. Cf. Bhâshya on V., 1, 20:

असमासे निष्कादिभ्यः । असमास इति किमर्थम् । परमनिष्केण क्रीतं परमनैष्किकम् । नैतदस्ति । निष्कशब्दात्प्रत्ययो विधीयते तत्र कः प्रसङ्गो यत्परमनिष्कशब्दात्स्यात् । नैव प्राप्नोति नार्थः प्रतिषेधेन । तदन्तविधिना प्राप्नोति । ग्रहणवता प्रातिपदिकेन तदन्तविधिः प्रतिषिध्यते । अत उत्तरं पठति । निष्कादिष्वसमासग्रहणं ज्ञापकं पूर्वत्र तदन्ताप्रतिषेधस्य । निष्कादिष्वसमासग्रहणं क्रियते ज्ञापनार्थम् । किं ज्ञाप्यम् । एतज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यः पूर्वत्र तदन्तविधेः प्रतिषेधो न भवतीति । किमेतस्य ज्ञापने प्रयोजनम् । प्राग्वतेष्ठञ् [५. १. १८] इत्यत्र तदन्तविधिः सिद्धो भवति । नैतदस्ति प्रयोजनम् । ग्रहणवता प्रातिपदिकेन तदन्तविधिः प्रतिषिध्यते न च ठञ्विधौ काचित्प्रकृतिर्गृह्यते ॥ इदं तर्हि प्रयोजनम् । आर्हादगोपुच्छसंख्यापरिमाणाट्ठक् [१९] परमगोपुच्छेन क्रीतं पारमगोपुच्छिकम् । एतदपि नास्ति प्रयोजनम् । विधौ प्रतिषेधः । प्रतिषेधश्चायम् ॥....

Kaiyaṭa: प्राग्वतेष्ठञ्...। तेन परमनिष्कशब्दाट्ठञ्सिद्धो भवति । केवलात्प्रातिपदिकाट्ठञ्विधीयमानः समासान्न स्यादित्याभासमात्रेणेदमुक्तम्... ॥

padika) ending with (पूर्व), and (P. V., 2, 87) would consequently be superfluous.[1]

---

1. The Jnâpaka of this Paribhâshâ is mentioned by Kaiyaṭa in his comment on P. V., 1, 20: पूर्वादिनिः सपूर्वाच्चेति प्रत्ययविधौ ग्रहणवतेत्येतस्याः परिभाषाया ज्ञापितत्वाद्यत्रैव प्रत्ययो विधीयते तत्रैवानया तदन्तविधिः प्रतिषिध्यते । अगोपुच्छसंख्यापरिमाणात् [५. १. १९] इत्यनेन तु ठक् प्रतिषिध्यत इति न तदन्तविधिप्रतिषेधो नापि व्यपदेशिवद्भावप्रतिषेधः ॥

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXXII.

(P. IV., 2, 60 teaches that the affix ठक् is added to a Prâtipadika which ends with सूत्र; P. V., 2, 45, that ड is added to a Prâtipadika which ends with दशान्; P. V., 2, 118, that ठञ् is added to a Prâtipadika which begins with एक or with गो). Now one might say that, (as the preceding Paribhâshâ forbids only the application of P. I., 1, 72, but not that of Paribh. XXX., to Prâtipadikas, सूत्र alone may by Paribh. XXX. be regarded as 'ending with सूत्र,' दशान् alone as 'ending with दशान्,' and एक or गो as 'beginning with एक or with गो,' and that therefore) the rules P. IV., 2, 60, P. V., 2, 45, P. V., 2, 118 etc. may in accordance with Paribh. XXX. be applied also to the word सूत्र alone, to the word दशान् alone, and to the words एक etc. alone. To refute this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

### P. XXXII: Paribhâshâ XXX does not apply to a Prâtipadika.

(सूत्र alone can consequently not be regarded as 'ending with सूत्र,' एक alone not as 'beginning with एक' etc.).

The fact that (Pâṇini) makes the (two) separate rules (V., 2, 86 पूर्वादिनिः and 87 सपूर्वाच्च) which he certainly, (in case this Paribhâshâ did not exist), might have united in the one rule पूर्वात्सपूर्वादिनिः, indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ. If the Paribhâshâ did not exist, the one rule पूर्वात्सपूर्वादिनिः would have sufficed, because पूर्व would by Paribh. XXX. likewise have been considered as पूर्व सपूर्व *i. e.* as 'ending with पूर्व' and इनि would then by the rule पूर्वात्सपूर्वादिनिः have been added also to पूर्व when standing alone). Nor can one maintain that (the two rules P. V., 2, 86 and 87) are read as we read them (*i. e.* as two separate rules) in order that (सपूर्वाच्च) may be valid in (the following) rule 88, and that in consequence of this (validity of सपूर्वात् in 88) words like अनिष्टिन् are formed (by P. V, 2, 88); for on the authority of the Bhâshya[1] in which (the separate reading of P. V., 2, 86 and 87) is regarded as the Jnâpaka (of this Paribhâshâ), forms like अनिष्टिन् are inadmissible; and moreover there would have been no reason why (only) so much (of the whole पूर्वात्सपूर्वादिनिः as सपूर्वात्) should not have been valid[2] in the sequel even if (the two rules 86 and 87) had been united so as to form one rule.

It is only[3] because (the present Paribhâshâ does exist) that the rule P. V., 2, 49 (by which the augment म is prefixed to the affix डट् when the latter is added to a numeral that does not begin with a numeral) serves a purpose. On the other hand, (if the Paribhâshâ did not exist,) पञ्चन् etc. might by Paribh. XXX.

1. See Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72; Ed. Ballantyne p. 789.

2. *Viz.* by Paribh. XVIII.

3. P.: Nâgojîbhaṭṭa mentions now another Jnâpaka of the present Paribhâshâ; in doing so he does not state his own view but that of former grammarians (प्राञ्चः).

likewise be considered as 'beginning with a numeral,' and in that case P. V., 2, 49 would clearly be altogether useless. And[1] this (Paribhâshâ) applies wherever a term is employed which cannot denote anything but a Prâtipadika, but it does not apply where a term is employed which may denote both a Prâtipadika and also something else than a Prâtipadika. There is therefore nothing strange (in its not applying to the term उगित्[2]) in P. IV., 1, 6; this may be seen in the Bhâshya[3] on that very rule. According to the Bhâshya and Kaiyaṭa on P. V., 1, 20[4] this and the

---

1. P.: In order to indicate that the statement of former grammarians which has just been repeated, is incorrect, and desirous of stating distinctly where the present Paribhâshâ applies and where it does not apply, Nâgojîbhaṭṭa gives us now his own Siddhânta, by way of guarding against too wide an application of this Paribhâshâ. The word ग्रहणवता is valid from the preceding Paribhâshâ, and this is one more reason why this Paribhâshâ has been placed after Paribh. XXXI.

2. *Viz.* because उगित् does not denote merely Prâtipadikas, but denotes also affixes etc., and because the term प्रातिपदिकात्, although it is valid from P. IV., 1, 1, is not actually employed in P. IV., 1, 6.

3. There it is stated that उगितश्च may mean उगिदन्तात्प्रातिपदिकात् 'after a Prâtipadika which ends with an उगित् etc.'; against this explanation the objection is raised that according to it ङीप् would by P. IV., 1, 6 be added to अतिभवत् etc., but that on account of the prohibition व्यपदेशिवद्भावो ऽप्रातिपदिकेन it could not be added to भवत्. This objection is afterwards refuted with the remark that व्यपदेशिवद्भावो ऽप्रातिपदिकेन does not concern उगित् because नैतत्प्रातिपदिकग्रहणं प्रातिपदिकाप्रातिपदिकयोरेतद्ग्रहणम्, on which Kaiyaṭa comments: उगिद्ग्रहणस्य तदुगादिति शब्दरूपमात्रमन्यपदार्थ आश्रीयते न तु प्रातिपदिकमेवेत्यर्थः.

4. There it has been said that Pâṇini employs the word असमासे in V., 1, 20 in order to show that the Tadantavidhi is not forbidden in

preceding Paribhâshâ are applicable only where the addition of an affix is taught; the rule P. VIII., 2, 68, *e. g.*, concerns therefore the word परमाहन् and also the word अहन् alone.[1]

---

the preceding rule V., 1, 19, and that ठञ् may therefore be added *e. g.* to परमगोपुच्छ. This however is rejected by the statement that the Tadantavidhi is forbidden where the addition of an affix is taught, whereas by अगोपुच्छ etc. the addition of the affix ठक् is prohibited; cf. note on pag. 163. Pâyagunda goes on to say that the fact that this Paribhâshâ applies only where the addition of an affix is taught, proves the incorrectness of the opinion of former grammarians regarding the rule P. V., 2, 49, which has been repeated by Nâgojîbhatta above; for, he says, this Paribhâshâ cannot apply in P. V., 2, 49 because no addition of an affix is taught in that rule. One ought therefore to supply the words इति केचित् after the sentence अत एव नान्ताद°... स्यटमेव. He further refutes the objection that this Paribhâshâ does not apply merely where the addition of an affix is taught, but that it is likewise applicable where something connected with an affix is taught, and that it might therefore apply also in P. V., 2, 49; for, he remarks, even if this were admitted, the Paribhâshâ would not be applicable in P. V., 2, 49, because the term नान्तात् in that rule differs in no way from उगितः in IV., 1, 6 (नान्तात् being a Varnagrahana and no Prâtipadika being given in V., 2, 49); as the Paribhâshâ is not applicable in P. IV., 1, 6, it can likewise not be applied in P. V. 2, 49. In the latter rule no Vyapades'ivadbhâva takes place either on account of the Vis'eshana असंख्यादेः or because, if it did take place, the rule would have no sense. Pâyagunda thus tries to defend Nâgojîbhatta from an inconsistency, but there is nothing to prove that the latter did not consider P. V., 2, 49 as offering a genuine example for this Paribhâshâ.

1. Kaiyata remarks on P. I., 1, 72 (Ed. p. 789) that the Paribhâshâ व्यपदेशिवद्भावोऽप्रातिपदिकेन applies where the word अन्त has actually been given in a rule, as *e. g.* in दशान्तोडः; and Nâgojîbhatta in his comment

More elsewhere.[1]

---

on Kaiyaṭa's words observes that the word अन्त denotes by implication other words, and that the Paribh. applies therefore also in the case of एकगोपूर्वात् etc. According to this view the Paribhâshâ could not possibly apply in P. VIII., 2, 68. Râghavendra observes therefore in regard to the words तेनाहन् etc.: 'Really this Paribhâshâ applies only when words like अन्त etc. are given in a rule (and it can therefore not apply in P. VIII., 2, 68) etc.'

1. Pâyaguṇḍa concludes his remarks on this Paribhâshâ with a passage which is taken from Nâgojîbhaṭṭa's commentary on P. I., 1, 72, Ed. Ballantyne p. 788 ननु समास°—चमत्कारि. If we consider a word which occurs in a rule, in which प्रातिपदिक is valid, as Vis'eshaṇa of प्रातिपदिक, we have a Vis'eshaṇavis'eshyabhâva and must apply the Tadantavidhi (P. I., 1, 72); but if we consider the word प्रातिपदिक as Vis'eshaṇa of the word which is actually given in the rule, we have a Vis'eshaṇavis'eshyabhâvavyatyâsa, *i. e.* a reversion of the Vis'eshaṇavis'eshyabhâva; in the latter case the Tadantavidhi is not applicable. Now one might argue thus: 'As the Vârttika समासप्रत्ययविधौ प्रतिषेधः etc. shows us only the import of the Vis'eshaṇavis'eshyabhâvavyatyâsa, *i. e.* shows us where the Vis'eshaṇavis'eshyabhâvá is reversed (*viz.* in a Pratyaya-, and a Samâsa-vidhi), the Tadantavidhi might, just as it is applied to दिति (cf. Bhâshya p. 788) be applied also to दशन् etc., and the actual addition of the word अन्त to दशन् in दशान्ताड्डः is in itself sufficient to show that this rule has no concern with the simple word दशन् etc; consequently the Paribhâshâ व्यपदेशिवद्भावोऽप्रातिपदिकेन is useless. (Hereby the opinion that in consequence of the prohibition Paribh. XXXI. ग्रहणवता etc. P. V., 2, 45 would not apply to a Prâtipadika that ends with दशन् if the word अन्त had not been added to दशन् in V., 2, 45, is rejected). Moreover the Paribh. व्यपदेशिवद्भावोऽप्रातिपदिकेन is useless, because, just as it was said before (cf. Kaiyaṭa p. 788) that the affix ण्य cannot be added to परमदिति because the new word which would re-

sult from the addition of the affix, is not in use, so one may say here, that the affix उ cannot be added to the simple दशन् etc., because the new word that would result from the addition of the affix is not used.'

This, however, is untenable. Just as the prohibition समासप्रत्ययविधौ प्रतिषेधः is necessary as showing the import of the Vis'eshaṇavis'eshya-bhâvavyatyâsa, so the Paribhâshâ व्यपदेशिवद्भावोऽप्रातिपदिकेन is necessary (as showing where the Tadantavidhi alone is applicable). The Tadantavidhi would be applied too widely if it were applied also in the absence of that which shows the meaning intended by the Sûtra, Vârttika and Bhâshya (*i. e.* if it were applied everywhere, without any regard to the Vârttika समासप्रत्ययविधौ etc.). Therefore उगिद्वर्णग्रहणवर्जम् (which would have no meaning if the Tadantavidhi were applicable everywhere) serves a purpose. On the other hand, to reject (the addition of an affix) by saying that the new word which would result from the addition of the affix would not denote anything or would not be in use, has nothing strange in it (and this course has therefore been rightly adopted in the case of परमदिति).

To indicate all this, Nâgojîbhaṭṭa concludes with the words इत्यन्यत्र (*i. e.* उद्योतादौ) विस्तरः 'more elsewhere.'

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXXIII.

One might ask : How is it that (the words यि प्रत्यये etc.) in P. VI., 1, 79 etc. mean 'when an affix follows which *begins* with य्'?[1] To answer this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says :

P. XXXIII : When a term which denotes a letter[2]

---

1. यि प्रत्यये ought according to P. I., 1, 72 to convey the meaning 'when an affix follows which *ends* with य्.'

2. अल्ग्रहणे does not mean अलो ग्रहणे *i. e.* उच्चारणे 'when a letter is enunciated (in a rule)' for in that case the Paribhâshâ would not apply

**is exhibited (in a rule) in (the form of) the Locative case (and qualifies something else which likewise stands in the Locative case, that which is qualified by it must be regarded as) beginning with the letter (which is denoted by the term in question, and not as ending with it).**[1]

This (Paribhâshâ) is an exception to P. I., 1, 72. It is given verbatim in the Bhâshya on P. I., 1, 72 as an independent rule.[2] And it is applicable where (a term which denotes a letter is exhibited in a rule) in the *form* of the Locative case, (but it is not necessary that this Locative case should convey the *meaning* of the Locative.[3] It applies) therefore *e. g.* in P. VII., 2, 8 (notwithstanding that the Locative वशि कृति conveys the sense of a Genitive case, and) and we derive (by it) (from वशि

---

to Pratyâhâras like वश् etc., but it means अलः प्रतिपादकशब्दे 'when a word is employed which denotes a letter'. For this reason Patanjali on P. VII., 1, 73 is right in explaining व्यञ्जने by व्यञ्जनादौ. (अज्ग्रहणं किमर्थम् । इकोऽचि व्यञ्जने मा भूत् । इकोऽचीत्युच्यते व्यञ्जनादौ मा भूत् ).

1. यि प्रत्यये in P. VI., 1, 79 means therefore 'when an affix follows which begins with य्.'

2. Cf. Mahâbhâshya, Ed. Ballantyne p. 800, where the following example is given: अचि श्नुधातुभ्रुवां य्वोरियङुवङौ [ ६. ४. ७७ ] इतीहैव स्यात् श्रियौ भ्रुवौ । श्रियो भ्रुव इत्यत्र न स्यात् ।. Kaiyaṭa observes that the Paribhâshâ is an exception to P. I., 1, 72, अत एव विशेषणेन भवति नान्येन; and Nâgojîbhaṭṭa comments on the last words thus: अत एवेको यणचीत्यादौ न दोषः । यस्मिन्विधिरिति वाचनिकमेव । यस्मिन्निति सप्तम्यन्तोपलक्षणम । सप्तम्यन्तं यत्र विशेषणं तत्रेति यावत् ॥

3. स्वरूपसती; न तु स्वार्थविशिष्टा. P.

कृति) the meaning, 'of a Kṛit-affix which begins with one of the letters contained in the Pratyâhâra वश्.' And the fact that (Pâṇini), in saying वलादेः in the rule VII., 2, 35, employs the word आदि (after वल्, instead of saying simply वलि,) proves that this (Paribhâshâ) is only then applicable, when the term which denotes a letter and also something that is qualified by it stand both in the Locative case.[1] Accordinly (सि) in P. VIII., 3, 29, *e.g.*, (which does not qualify anything else) does not mean 'of that which follows provided it begin with स्' (but it means simply 'of the following स्'). How (ति) in P. VII., 2, 48, (से) in P. VII, 2, 57 etc. come to mean 'of that which begins with त्' etc., has been considered in the S'abdendus'ekhara.[2]

---

1. In P. VII., 2, 35 the Vis'eshya आर्धधातुक stands in the Genitive case.

2. P.: There the त् in P. VII.,2, 48 is made to qualify the वल् in वलादेः (of VII., 2, 35) which in its turn qualifies आर्धधातुक, and VII., 2, 48 is accordingly explained by तरूपवलादेरार्धधातुकस्य etc.; the Locative ति has, as referring to वल् in वलादेः, the meaning of a Nominative. The same applies to सि in VII., 2, 57. Pâyaguṇḍa adds: 'The construction of VII., 2, 48 is really not artificial; it is namely this, तकाराव्यवहितपरके-च्छत्यादेः परवलाद्यार्धधातुकस्येट्, and to indicate this the word अलम् has been employed there '(in the S'abdendus'ekhara).' He remarks further, in order to show how हलि which from P. VI., 4, 100 is valid in 101, where it qualifies हि, can mean 'beginning with one of the letters contained in the Pratyâhâra हल्,' although that which is qualified by it does not stand in the Locative: एवं हुझल्भ्यो हेर्धिरित्यत्र हलीत्यनुवृत्त्या हलादेर्हेरिति व्याख्यानपक्षे हल्ग्रहणानुवृत्तिसामर्थ्याद्धेस्तदन्तत्वासंभवात्तल्लाभ इति बोध्यम्.

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXXIV.

In order to show how (it is that *e. g.* of घट and पट two compounds) घटपटम् and घटपटौ[1] 'a jar and a piece of cloth' may be formed, (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

**P. XXXIV: Every Dvandva-compound may optionally take the terminations of the Singular.[2]**

('Every Dvandva-compound') means, 'every Dvandva-compound which does not fall under (any of the rules in) the chapter that begins with (the rule) P. II., 4, 2.'[3] As (Pâṇini) teaches by the rule II., 2, 29, that a Dvandva-compound (may) be formed (of any two or more nouns) without distinction[4] to denote the aggregate or the mutual union (of the persons or things denoted by those nouns), this (Paribhâshâ) is established by a maxim (accepted in grammar.[5] Moreover) the employment of the

---

1. One cannot object that by P. II., 4, 6 घटपटम् only ought to be formed; for that rule would apply if the genus 'jar' and 'cloth' were intended to be denoted by the nouns compounded, whereas घट and पट denote in this case an individual jar, and an individual piece of cloth. P.

2. Literally: 'That which is denoted by a Dvandva-compound may, (although it must really be more than one and although the compound ought therefore to take either the terminations of the dual or those of the plural), always be optionally considered as one, (and the compound may accordingly optionally take the terminations of the singular).'

3. If the Paribhâshâ did concern also such compounds as fall under the rules P. II., 4, 2 etc., that whole chapter would be useless.

4. *I. e.* Pâṇini's rule II., 2, 29 applies equally to all Dvandva-compounds except those which fall under any of the rules in the chapter beginning with the rule II., 4, 2.

5. *I. e.* it is established by the maxim expressed in P. II., 2, 29;

word बहुवचनस्य 'for the plural' in the rule P. I., 2, 63 indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ); for that (word बहुवचनस्य) serves the purpose of preventing (P. I., 2, 63) from applying to the neuter singular तिष्यपुनर्वसु; (this singular must therefore exist, because otherwise P. I., 2, 63 could not possibly apply to it, and बहुवचनस्य would be superfluous).[1] And one cannot say that even (if बहुवचनस्य in I., 2, 63 were to indicate the existence of this Paribhâshâ) the rule I., 2, 63 would serve no purpose because a Dvandva-compound of तिष्य and पुनर्वसू[2] ought by P. II., 4, 6 necessarily to take the terminations of the singular and because therefore a plural (of तिष्यपुनर्वसु) would not exist. (To say so would be wrong) because the rule I., 2, 63 indicates that also[3] that rule II., 4, 6 is optional (so far as a compound of तिष्य and पुनर्वसू is concerned[4]). Nor can one say that Tishya

---

for when the Dvandva-compound denotes the aggregate of the persons or things denoted by the nouns, it must take the terminations of the singular, otherwise those of the dual or plural.

1. If the present Paribhâshâ did not exist, a Dvandva-compound of तिष्य and पुनर्वसू could take only the terminations of the plural, and the singular इदं तिष्यपुनर्वसु would not exist.

2. *Scil.* Both not being living beings.

3. *I. e.* besides indicating by बहुवचनस्य that every Dvandva-compound may optionally take the terminations of the singular.

4. Because exactly so much is indicated by a Jnâpaka as is absolutely necessary for the removal of any inconsistency; (यावता विनानुपपत्तिस्तावन्मात्रस्य ज्ञाप्यत्वात् P.). Pâyagunḍa adds: or it may be that the restriction contained in II., 4, 6 refers to Dvandva-compounds the members of which denote a genus, and not to compounds the members of which denote individual things. And thus neither the word बहुवचनस्य in I., 2, 63 is useless, nor that whole rule, nor the rule II., 4, 6.

etc. are living beings, (that therefore a compound of तिष्य and पुनर्वसु does not fall under P. II., 4, 6 and that consequently I., 2, 63 cannot indicate that P. II., 4, 6 is optional); for according to the Veda-passage 'life consists of water' only those are living beings whose life wastes away in the absence of water, (which is not the case with Tishya etc.). And (all) this is found in the Bhâshya on the rule P. I., 2, 63.[1]. The[2] employ-

---

1. Cf. Bhâshya on P. I., 2, 63: बहुवचनस्येति किमर्थम्। उदितं तिष्यपुनर्वसु। कथं चात्रैकवचनम्। जातिद्वन्द्व एकवद्भवतीति। अप्राणिनामिति प्रतिषेधः प्राप्नोति। एवं तर्हि सिद्धे सति यद्बहुवचनग्रहणं करोति तज्ज्ञापयत्याचार्यः सर्वो द्वन्द्वो विभाषैकवद्भवतीति। किमेतस्य ज्ञापने प्रयोजनम्। बाभ्रवशालङ्कायनं बाभ्रवशालङ्कायना इत्येतत्सिद्धं भवति। अथवा नात्रभवन्तः प्राणिनः प्राणा एवात्रभवन्तः॥

Kaiyaṭa: जातिद्वन्द्व इति। कथमनयोर्जातिशब्दत्वं यावता जातिप्रदेशेषु भिन्नाधारा जातिर्गृह्यते न त्ववस्थाभेदकल्पितभेदैकवस्तुविषया। एवं तर्हि प्रतिमन्वन्तरं भिन्नानि नक्षत्राणीति दर्शने भिन्नाधारा जातिः संभवतीति न कश्चिद्दोषः॥ सर्वो द्वन्द्व इति। अप्राणिजातिद्वन्द्वो नित्यमेकवद्भवति प्राणिद्वन्द्वस्तु विकल्पेन। न्यायसिद्धश्चार्थो बहुवचनग्रहणेन लिङ्गेन सूच्यते। एकवद्भावप्रकरणं हि विषयविभागार्थमारब्धम्। प्राण्यङ्गादीनां समाहार एव न तु प्राण्यङ्गादीनामेव समाहार इति। ततस्तत्प्रकरणानुपात्तानां समाहारेतरेतरयोगयोर्द्वन्द्वः सिद्ध एव॥ अथवेति। न ह्येतेषु लोके प्राणिव्यवहारः सिद्ध इति भावः॥ प्राणा एवेति। तदधीनस्थितित्वात्प्राणिनामित एव प्राणा उच्यन्ते॥

2. Now one might say: 'on the alternative that Tishya etc. are living beings, the rule P. I., 2, 63 cannot indicate that P. II., 4, 6 is optional, because a Dvandva-compound of तिष्य etc. would not fall under that rule; as further the restriction conveyed in P. II., 4, 2 etc. is this, that aggregative Dvandva-compounds are formed only of nouns that denote members of living beings etc., and not of any other nouns, no aggregative compound can be formed of तिष्य and पुनर्वसु; consequently the singular तिष्यपुनर्वसु does not exist, and बहुवचनस्य in P. I., 2, 63, which was said to have been employed in order to prevent the application of that rule to the singular तिष्यपुनर्वसु, is useless.' To meet this

ment of बहुवचनस्य in P. I., 2, 63 proves also, that the restriction (which is intended to be) conveyed by P. II., 4, 2, etc. (is this, that the compounds treated of in those rules denote only an aggregate but no mutual union, and that it) cannot be the inverse restriction, *viz.* that aggregative Dvandva-compounds are formed only of such nouns as denote members of living beings etc. (but not of any other nouns, for with the latter restriction बहुवचनस्य in I., 2, 63 would be superfluous[1]).

---

objection, Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says अत एव *i. e.* because बहुवचनस्य has been employed in P. I., 2, 63.

1. *Viz.* because the formation of the aggregative Dvandva-compound would be impossible.

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXXV.

### P. XXXV : All rules are optional in the Veda.

This (Paribhâshâ) has been established in the Bhâshya[1] on P. III., 1, 85, where a separate rule is made of the portion बहुलम् 'variously' (of III., 1, 85, छन्दसि being valid from the preced-

---

1. *Viz.* by the formation of the rule छन्दसि बहुलम्, or of the rule छन्दसि वा, which is still shorter. Cf. Bhâshya on P. I., 4, 9:

षष्ठीयुक्तश्छन्दसि वा ॥ योगविभागः कर्तव्यः । षष्ठीयुक्तश्छन्दसि । षष्ठीयुक्तः पतिशब्दश्छन्दसि घिसंज्ञो भवति । ततो वा । वा छन्दसि सर्वे विधयो भवन्ति । सुपां व्यत्ययः । तिङां व्यत्ययः । वर्णव्यत्ययः । लिङ्गव्यत्ययः । कालव्यत्ययः । पुरुषव्यत्ययः । आत्मनेपदव्यत्ययः । परस्मैपदव्यत्ययः ॥ सुपां व्यत्ययः । युक्ता मातासीद्धुरि दक्षिणायाः [ऋग्वे° १. १६४. ९] दक्षिणायामिति प्राप्ते ॥ तिङां व्यत्ययः । चषालं ये अश्वयूपाय तक्षति [ऋग्वे° १. १६२. ६] तक्षन्तीति प्राप्त इत्यादि ॥

Kaiyaṭa: योगविभाग इति । तेन परिभाषा संपद्यते । यावदिह शास्त्रे कार्यं तच्छन्दसि वा भवति । तत्रानयैव सिद्धत्वाद्बहुलं छन्दसीत्यादि न वक्तव्यम् ॥

ing rule), and also (in the Bhâshya) on P. I., 4, 9, where a separate rule is made of the portion वा 'optionally' (of I., 4, 9, छन्दसि being supplied from the same rule). This accounts e. g. for (the Parasmaipada युध्यति in the Veda-passage) प्रतीपमन्य ऊर्मिर्युध्यति; (according to P. I., 3, 12) युध् ought to have taken the termination of the Âtmanepada.

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXXVI.

One might ask: How is (it that) e. g. in क्षियः (of P. VI., 4, 59, and VIII., 2, 46) इयङ् (has in accordance with P. VI., 4, 77 been substituted for the इ of क्षि, although the latter is not a root but is merely the imitative name of the root क्षि[1]) ? To answer this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

**P. XXXVI: An imitative name is like its original.[2]**

The fact that (the substitute) इयङ् has (in P. VI., 4, 59 and VIII,, 2, 46) actually been put down in क्षियः, indicates (the existence of) this (Paribhâshâ, for it shows that the imitative name क्षि of the root क्षि is treated exactly like the latter). When, on the other hand, in the same (form क्षियः of P. VI., 4, 59 etc.) a case-termination, which cannot be added except to a Prâtipadika, has been added (to क्षि), this proves that the present (Paribhâshâ) is not invariably valid. (If the imitative name क्षि of

1. A root denotes an action, whereas क्षि in P. VI., 4, 59 and VIII., 2, 46 denotes the root क्षि and is therefore not a root.

2. *Scil.* and undergoes therefore the same operations which the original would have to undergo.

the root क्षि were invariably treated like the root क्षि, no case-termination could have been added to it, because according to P. I., 2, 45 a root is not termed *Prâtipadika*). This is found in the Bhâshya on the rule P. VIII., 2, 46.[1]

1. The Paribhâshâ is, so far as क्षियः is concerned, unnecessary because क्षिय् may be considered as an imitative name of that form of the root क्षि which the latter assumes before vowel-terminations.

---

Bhâshya[1] on P. VIII., 2, 46: क्षियो दीर्घात्॥ दीर्घादिति किमर्थम्। आक्षितमसि मा मे क्षेष्ठाः। दीर्घादिति शक्यमवक्तुम्। कस्मान्न भवति। अक्षितमासि मा मे क्षेष्ठा इति। निर्देशादेवेदं व्यक्तं दीर्घस्य ग्रहणमिति। यदि ह्रस्वस्य ग्रहणं स्यात्क्षेरित्येव ब्रूयात्॥ नात्र निर्देशः प्रमाणं शक्यं कर्तुम्। यथैव ह्यत्राप्राप्ता विभक्तिरेवमियङादेशो ऽपि। नात्राप्राप्ता विभक्तिः। सिद्धात्र विभक्तिः प्रातिपदिकादिति। कथं प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा। अर्थवत्प्रातिपदिकमिति। ननु चाधातुरिति प्रतिषेधः प्राप्नोति। नैष धातुः। धातोरेतदनुकरणम्। यद्यनुकरणमियङादेशो न प्राप्नोति। प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं भवतीतीयङादेशो भविष्यति। यदि प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं भवतीत्युच्यते स्वाद्युत्पत्तिर्न प्राप्नोति। एवं तर्ह्यतिदे-

1. Kaiyaṭa: अक्षितामिति। क्षयः क्षितामिति भावे क्तः। भावश्च ण्यदर्थे इति दीर्घाभावान्नत्वाभावः॥ क्षेरिति। इयङादेशात्परत्वाद्धेर्ङितीति [७. ३. १११] इति गुणस्य न्याय्यत्वात्॥ नात्र निर्देश इति। न हीयङादेशाद्दीर्घस्य ग्रहणं प्रत्येतुं शक्यत इयङ्निमित्तस्य विभक्तेर्दुर्लभत्वात्ततो ऽप्राप्ता यथा विभक्तिः सौत्रत्वान्निर्देशस्य भवत्येवं ह्रस्वस्यापीयङादेशः स्यादिति दीर्घग्रहणमर्थवत्॥ नैष धातुरिति। क्रियावाचिनो धातुसंज्ञाविधानान्निर्देशे चाक्रियावाचित्वात्॥ प्रकृतिवदिति। अर्थभेदादनुकार्यानुकरणयोर्भेदाद्वाचानिकः कार्यातिदेशः॥ स्वाद्युत्पत्तिर्नेति। अधातुरिति प्रकृतेः प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञानिषेधादनुकरणस्यापि तत्प्रसङ्गात्॥ आतिदेशिकानामिति। अतिदेशः प्रयोजनं येषां तान्यातिदेशिकान्यतिदेशभा-

शिकानां स्वाश्रयाण्यपि न निवर्तन्ते । अथाप्येतन्नातिदेशिकानां स्वाश्रयाण्यपि न निवर्तन्त इति । एवमपि न दोषः । अवश्यमत्र सर्वतो नैर्देशिकी विभक्तिर्वक्तव्या । तद्यथा नेर्विशः [ १. ३. १७ ] परिव्यवेभ्यः क्रियः [ १. ३. १८ ] विपराभ्यां जेः [ १. ३. १९ ] इत्येवमर्थम् । अथाप्येतन्नास्ति प्रकृतिवदनुकरणं भवतीति । एवमपि न दोषः । धातोरजादौ यद्रूपं तदनुक्रियते ॥

---

व्युच्यन्ते । ननु यदतिदेशकार्येणाविरुद्धं स्वाश्रयं कार्यं तन्मा निवर्ततां यत्तु विरुद्धं तत्कथं न निवर्तेत । एवं तर्ह्यधातुरिति पर्युदासो न प्रसज्यप्रतिषेधं इत्यातिदेशिकस्य कार्यस्याभावाद्धातोरन्यत्वात्स्वाश्रया प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञा प्रवर्तते प्रसज्यप्रतिषेधे तु निषेध एवातिदेशिकः स्यात् । इयङादेशस्त्वातिदेशिको धातोर्विधीयमानत्वाद्भवति स च दीर्घस्यैवेति दीर्घग्रहणमनर्थकं स्यात् ॥ अथापीति । यद्यप्यधातुरिति प्रसज्यप्रतिषेध इति भावः ॥ अवश्यमिति । यस्मात्प्रातिपदिकसंज्ञानिषेधादप्राप्ता यस्माच्चोत्पन्ना लुप्ता तस्मात्सर्वस्मादित्यर्थः ॥ नेर्विश इति । नेरिति लुप्तविभक्तिकाव्ययानुकरणान्निर्देशार्था विभक्तिर्विश इति निर्देशादेवाप्राप्ता विभक्तिरियङ् तु दीर्घानुकरणस्यैवेति दीर्घग्रहणमनर्थकम् ॥ अथापीति । इहानुकर्ता कदाचित्सामान्यमनुकरोति कदाचिद्विशेषं तत्र यदा सामान्यमनुक्रियते तदा विशेषनिबन्धनस्य कार्यस्य सामान्येऽभावात्प्रकृतावदृष्टत्वादनुकरणेऽप्यभावो यदा तु विशेषोऽनुक्रियते तदा तन्निबन्धनं कार्यमनुकरणे प्रवर्तते । तत्र यदा धात्वधातुसामान्यं क्षिमात्रमनुक्रियते तदेयङोऽप्राप्तिरिति चिक्षियतुरित्यादौ कृतेयङादेशस्येदमनुकरणमिति दीर्घादिति कर्तव्यम् ॥

---

## PARIBHÂSHÂ XXXVII.

One might ask: How is it that *e. g.* रामौ, after the Vṛiddhi vowel (औ) has been substituted (for the final अ of राम and the case-termination औ), should also on the Kâryakâlapaksha be termed a *Pada* ?[1] For (one might argue), as (औ) cannot be

---

1. The question whether रामौ be a *Pada* or not, arises when रामौ is employed before a verb, in such phrases as रामौ पश्य. P. VIII., 1, 28 teaches that a Pada which ends with a तिङ् is anudâtta when it fol-

considered both as the final (of that to which the termination औ has been added) and at the same time as the initial (of the

---

lows upon a Pada which does not end with a तिङ्. If रामौ be a Pada, पश्य must by this rule be anudâtta, but if it be no Pada, P. VIII., 1, 28 does not apply to पश्य. The Samjnâ-rule P. I., 4, 14 which teaches that a word which ends with a सुप् or a तिङ् is termed a Pada, is on the Kâryakâlapaksha placed near P. VIII., 1, 28 and applies when that rule applies; that rule however takes effect only when रामौ is followed by पश्य *i. e.* after the formation of रामौ has been completed; consequently P. I., 4, 14 ought likewise to be applied after रामौ has been formed; but at that time रामौ cannot be called 'ending with a सुप्' and it can therefore on the Kâryakâlapaksha not be termed a Pada. Nor can रामौ be termed a Pada on the Yathoddes'apaksha, for although on this alternative P. VIII., 1, 28 takes its position near P. I., 4, 14, the latter rule can also in this case not be applied until P. VIII., 1, 28 is applicable, *i. e.* until रामौ has been formed and is followed by पश्य. If one however accepts Kaiyaṭa's view (pag. 6) that the Yathoddes'apaksha 'refers to those scholars who accept what they are taught as they hear it, and who, when they have understood the meaning of a particular sentence (in which a Samjnâ or a Paribhâshâ is taught) rest satisfied with the general knowledge that what they have learned will be of some use on a future occasion,' one has to apply the term *Pada* already to राम + औ *i. e.* before the substitution which is taught in P. VI., 1, 88, has taken place.

Pâyaguṇḍa and Bhairavamis'ra adopt the view that रामौ can neither on the Kâryakâlapaksha nor on the Yathoddes'apaksha be termed a Pada, the reason which Bhairava brings forward being 'यथोद्देशपक्षेऽपि पूर्वकालप्रवृत्तस्य पदत्वस्यैकादेशे कृते रामावित्यादौ समुदायस्यान्यत्वादलाभात्.' According to the author of the Sarvamangalâ, on the other hand, there is no reason why रामौ on the Yathoddes'apaksha should not be termed a Pada. His own words are: न च यथोद्देशे राम औङित्यत्र पदत्वान्नित्यत्वा-

termination औ,[1] रामौ) does not begin with that (राम) to which (औ) has been added and end with that (termination औ, and it ought consequently not to be regarded as 'ending with a case-termination' or, in other words, it ought not to be termed a *Pada* by P. I., 4, 14). To answer this (the author of the Paribhâshâs) says:

P. XXXVII: That which has undergone a change in regard to one of its parts, is by no means (in consequence of this change) something else (than what it was before the change had taken place).

(Literally, 'it is not like something else'). The word अनन्यवत् means 'not like something else.' As that (which has undergone a change in regard to one of its parts) is (hereby) forbidden to be (considered as) *similar* to something else (than what it

---

दन्तरङ्गत्वाद्वृद्धिरेचि [ ६. १. ८८ ] इत्यस्य प्रवृत्त्या पदत्वस्य स्थानिधर्मत्वाभावेन तत्रापि तदसिद्धिरिति वाच्यम् । वृद्धिरेचीत्यस्य पूर्वसवर्णदीर्घेण बाधे प्राप्ते (by VI., 1, 102) तस्य नादिचि [ ६. १. १०४ ] इति निषेधे ततो वृद्धिनिषेधसमकालमेव पदत्वमिति न दोषः ॥. Râghavendrâchârya says that some remark that what Nâgojîbhaṭṭa says here concerning the Kâryakâlapaksha of the Padasamjnâ-rule I., 4, 14 is contrary to the statement made above (pag. 12) that in regard to the terms *Bha*, *Pada* etc. in P. I., 4—II., 2, there exists only the Yathoddes'apaksha. But Bhairavamis'ra refutes this remark by stating that the terms *Bha*, *Pada* etc. are restricted to the Yathoddes'apaksha only when two of those terms apply simultaneously.

1. The substitute औ for अ + औ may either be considered as part of the base, and in that case it cannot be called a case-termination; or it may be regarded as case-termination, but if this be done the base to which the case-termination has been added (*viz.* राम) ceases to exist.

was before the change had taken place), it can *a fortiori* not be (considered as altogether) something else.[1] On this account such (a word) conveys (after it has undergone the change in regard to one of its parts) the meaning (which it conveyed before. If) on the contrary (the word subsequently to the change were a different word) it would not convey (the meaning which it conveyed before), because one would no (longer) observe in it the sequence (of letters etc.) which determines its ability of possessing a particular force. And thus (राम remains after the loss of its final अ, *i. e.* after it has been changed to) राम्, when it (really) ends with म्, (still राम, and राम्) is (therefore like राम) that to which (औ) has been added; the (remaining) औ (which has been substituted for अ + औ) may be considered as the initial of the latter (औ) and is therefore a case-termination; accordingly the fact that (रामौ) begins with that (to which औ has been added) and ends with (औ, in other words, its ending with a case-termination or its being a Pada) is established by the circumstance that it combines in itself the meanings[2] (of a base and a case-affix. राम्) ending with म् is considered as that (to which औ has been added, *i. e.* as राम), after the manner in which one calls a dog whose tail has been cut off (still) a dog, (and its being regarded as such is there-

1. Some explain अनन्यवत्, which they consider to be formed by means of the possessive affix मतुप्, by 'not possessed of the peculiarities or properties inherent in something else.' (केचित्तु वृत्तिविषयेऽन्यशब्दस्य धर्मपरत्वेन मतुपा चान्यत्वस्यैव निषेधोऽनयेत्याहुः P.).

2. आर्थसमाजग्रस्तमिति । अर्थानामयमार्थः समाजस्तेन ग्रस्तमालिङ्गितम् । वर्तमानार्थसमुदायान्तर्गतम् । तदादितदन्तत्वं प्रकृतिप्रत्ययरूपार्थसमुदायान्तर्भूतमिति यावत् ॥ Sarvamangalâ.

1. Ms. °न्तर्गततदन्तत्वं प्रकृति.°

fore) established by a maxim of ordinary life.[1] Just because this (maxim of ordinary life is adopted also in grammar), it has been remarked in the Bhâshya on the rule P. IV., 1, 83, subsequently to the statement that (दीव्यत् in) that (rule) represents the portion दीव्यत् of the word दीव्यति (in P. IV., 4, 2): 'why has (दीव्यति) been put down without (its final इ, *viz.* as दीव्यत्)? Pâṇini indicates (thereby), that the Paribhâshâ "that which has undergone a change in regard to one of its parts etc." is in existence (and is valid in his grammar).' This (circumstance that the validity of this Paribhâshâ which is established by a maxim of ordinary life is indicated by दीव्यत् in P. IV., 1, 83) proves the futility of the view, according to which this maxim applies only in the case of an operation that is taught in grammar and only in the case of a change that is taught in grammar, (for the dropping of the इ of दीव्यति is neither the one nor the other). But in regard to an operation that would depend on the part which has undergone a change (*e. g.* has been lost) this (maxim) is not (applicable), because, just as in the case of a dog whose tail has been cut off, it would be difficult to speak of (the dog) as having a tail, so it would (here) be difficult to make out that the part, after it has been dropped, is still present.[2] From the said consideration this (maxim) is

---

1. This maxim of ordinary life is based on the circumstance that even though an object may be deprived of some of its parts, the perception of the greater number of parts that remain will still tell, to what kind or class the perceived object belongs. (भूयोऽवयवदर्शनं जातिव्यञ्जकम् P.).

2. *Viz.* because the greater number of parts that remain tells us nothing about the part which has been lost. An operation therefore which solely depends on the part that has disappeared cannot take effect by this Paribhâshâ.

likewise not (applicable) in the case of (a word etc.) which is given (in a rule) by means of a definite sequence (or limited number of letters etc.)[1] This is suggested in the Bhâshya and by Kaiyaṭa on P. I., 1, 72.[2]

Where,[3] on the other hand, half[4] or more than half[5] (of any word etc.) has undergone a change, there the Sthânivatsûtra (P. I., 1, 56 alone) can teach us that (any) operations (which would have depended on the original) take effect (also in the changed form); for here one does not recognize (that which has undergone the change) to be the same (what it was before the change had taken place), because one does not perceive (in the changed form) the greater number of parts (of the original) which, (had they been perceptible), would have indicated the

---

1. Although *e. g.* we perceive in सर्वक the greater number or rather all the parts of सर्व, which perception could tell us the kind or class to which the word सर्वक belongs, nevertheless, as the name *Sarvanâman* is given to the particular sequence of letters सर्व, we cannot term सर्वक a *Sarvanâman*, because it neither contains the particular sequence of letters सर्व, nor does it end with it.

2. See Mahâbhâshya I., 1, 72, Ed. Ballantyne pag. 783 etc., especially the remarks of Nâgojîbhaṭṭa:

भक्तपरिमाणानामिति । अत्र परिमाणमानुपूर्वीविशेषोऽपि । परिमाणेत्युपलक्षणं परिच्छिन्नार्थानां तदाह संख्येति ॥ नन्वविकृतगब्वादिजननेऽपि शुनः श्वत्ववदकस्याधिकस्योपजनेऽपि सर्वकस्य सर्वशब्दत्वमक्षतमेवेत्यत आह । नित्या इति । वस्तुतः परिच्छिन्नपरिमाणकग्रहण एकदेशविकृतन्यायस्याप्यप्रवृत्तिरिति भाष्याशयः ॥

Pâyaguṇḍa refers us also to the Bhâshya etc. on P. I., 4, 13.

3. This is to prevent the supposition that the present Paribhâshâ renders the Sthânivatsûtra superfluous.

4. As *e. g.* by P. III., 4, 86 एरुः.

5. As *e. g.* by P. VI., 4, 20 ज्वरत्वर°.

class (or nature of the changed form; and consequently this Paribhâshâ cannot be applied. The Sthânivatsûtra is) likewise (necessary) to make one recognize that (portion of anything) which undergoes the change, as still part (of the whole even after the change has taken place), except when that portion is a letter.

Occasionally, however, to suit particular forms (which have to be formed or to be accounted for by certain rules) the maxim (which is expressed in this Paribhâshâ) is disregarded. In this manner we are able to account for such forms as अभीयात्.[1] And that a maxim occasionally is not applied has been distinctly stated by Kaiyaṭa[2] on P. VI., 1, 102. More elsewhere.[3]

---

1. If this Paribhâshâ were everywhere applied, the part अभ् of अभीयात् would after the substitution of ई for the final of अभि and the initial of इयात् or ईयात् be termed a *Pada*, just as the original अभि is termed a *Pada*; subsequently ब् should be substituted for भ् by P. VIII., 2, 39. Cf. Bhairavamis'ra: न चात्रोपसर्गसंज्ञाया अक्तपरिमाणनिष्ठतयानेन न्यायेनोपसर्गत्वाभावात्पूर्वोपयादितरीत्यैव सिद्धिरिति लक्ष्यानुरोधपर्यन्तानुसंधानं विफलमिति वाच्यम्। पदत्वस्यात्क्तपरिमाणनिष्ठत्वाभावेन भान्ते जश्त्वाभावसिध्द्यर्थं लक्ष्यानुरोधस्यावश्यकत्वात् ॥. See P. VII., 4, 24, by which, one might suppose, इ should be substituted also for the ई of अभीयात्; but this cannot be because अभ् is no *Upasarga*.

2. न हि वचनस्यासत्तासंभावना न्यायस्तु क्वचित्कश्चिदाश्रीयत इति युज्यते वक्तुम्.

3. *Viz.* in the S'abdendus'ekhara. There it is stated that this Paribhâshâ must be approved of by Patanjali because otherwise his remarks on P. I., 1, 57 (Ed. p. 661) about श्रायसौ would be wrong. श्रेयस् with अण् becomes श्रायस by P. VII., 3, 1; the Nom. Du. Masc. of श्रायस is श्रायस + औ=श्रायसौ. After the substitution in this form of औ for the final अ of श्रायस and the termination औ, श्रायस् is by this Paribhâshâ termed *Anga* just as the original श्रायस was termed *Anga*. Now श्रायस् being termed *Anga*, and this *Anga* the final of which is स being besides

उगित्, and moreover the following औ being *Sarvanâmasthâna*, आयस् should in accordance with P. VII., 1, 70 receive the augment नुम्. This is prevented in the Bhâshya by the rule अच: परस्मिन्पूर्वविधौ. But if the present Paribhâshâ were not valid, आयस् would not be termed *Anga*; consequently there would be no reason why it should receive the augment नुम्, and to prevent the addition of this augment by means of the rule अच: परस्मिन्पूर्वविधौ would be useless. This shows that Patanjali must have approved of the Paribhâshâ.

---